DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 070 171 EA 004 713

TITLE	Oversight Hearing on Elementary and Secondary Education. Hearing Before the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Ninety-Second Congress, Second Session on H.R.44, H.R.981, H.R.6179, H.R.7796, H.R.12695, and Related Proposals. Operation of Federal Support for Elementary and Secondary Education and the Future Direction of Federal Support for Elementary and Secondary Education.
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.
PUB DATE	23 Feb 72
NOTE	207p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$9.87
DESCRIPTORS	Disadvantaged Youth; *Educational Finance; Educational Quality; Elementary Schools; *Federal Aid; *Federal Government; *Federal Programs; Financial Problems; Inner City; Secondary Schools; *Urban Education

ABSTRACT

This document contains statements, letters, articles, and supplemental materials submitted by congressmen and educational representatives on categorical aid and general aid to education. The materials cover a broad spectrum of Federal programs. Many of the articles and statements focus on the problems of urban education. (JF)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 070171

OVERSIGHT HEARING ON ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-SECOND CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H.R. 44, H.R. 981, H.R. 1491, H.R. 6179, H.R. 7796, H.R. 12695, and Related Proposals

OPERATION OF FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AND THE FUTURE DIRECTION OF FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.,
FEBRUARY 23, 1972

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

CARL D. PERKINS, *Chairman*

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EA 004 713

79-836

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1972

1

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

EDITH GREEN, Oregon
FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., New Jersey
JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania
ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Illinois
DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey
JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
JAMES H. SCHEUER, New York
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
PHILLIP BURTON, California
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, New York
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
ELLA T. GRASSO, Connecticut
LOUISE DAY HICKS, Massachusetts
ROMANO [illegible]OLI, Kentucky
HERMAN [illegible] New York

ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
ALPHONZO BELL, California
OGDEN R. REID, New York
JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois
JOHN R. DELLENBACK, Oregon
MARVIN L. ESCH, Michigan
EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM A. STEIGER, Wisconsin
EARL F. LANDGREBE, Indiana
ORVAL HANSEN, Idaho
EARL B. RUTH, North Carolina
EDWIN B. FORSYTHE, New Jersey
VICTOR V. VEYSEY, California
JACK F. KEMP, New York
PETER A. PEYSER, New York

2

CONTENTS

Statement of— Page

Bianchi, William, uniserv director, South Bend Education Association ---- 155

Broyhill, Hon. Joel T., a Representative in Congress from the State or Virginia ---- 1

Buhrmaster, Kenneth E., president, National School Boards Association; Dr. George Oser, Board of Education, Houston, Tex., Independent School District; and Dr. Augustus W. Steinhilber, director of Federal and congressional relations, National School Boards Association ---- 6

Burkhead, G. C., superintendent emeritus of the Hardin County Schools, Elizabethtown, Ky ---- 49

Erst, Blanche M., chairman, Illinois Political Action Committee in Education ---- 69

Hand, Charles, Ayer, Mass.; G. C. Burkhead, Elizabethtown, Ky.; Francis Lauffenburg, Long Beach, Calif.; and George Membrino, Chicopee, Mass., representatives of impacted area school districts ---- 44

Hirschinger, Jim, Indiana State Teachers Association ---- 71

Laufenberg, Francis, representative of impacted areas school district, Long Beach, Calif ---- 53

McDonald, William C., president; Anthony C. Warren, Federal services coordinator; Doris Allen, title I teachers, Columbus, Ohio, representatives of Ohio Education Association of Teachers ---- 62

Megel, Carl, legislative director, American Federation of Teachers ---- 167

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental material, etc.:

Bassuener, David J., Ph. D., district administrator, Kiel public schools, Kiel, Wis., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated April 24, 1972 ---- 197

Brademas, Hon. John, a Representative in Congress from the State of Indiana, several articles from the Notre Dame Journal of Education ---- 73

Brown, Gene W., Sumner County schools, Gallatin, Tenn., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated April 24, 1972 ---- 199

Brownell, John A., chairman, ESEA Title III State Advisory Council, State of Hawaii Department of Education, letter to Congressman Matsunaga, dated April 18, 1972 ---- 202

Broyhill, Hon. Joel T., a Representative in Congress from the State of Virginia, statement of ---- 2

Buchmiller, Archie A., deputy State superintendent, for public instruction, Madison, Wis., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated April 17, 1972 ---- 186

Buhrmaster, Kenneth E., president, National School Boards Association, statement on behalf of the National School Boards Association ---- 6

Burkhead, G. C., superintendent emeritus of the Hardin County Schools, Elizabethtown, Ky., supplement to oral testimony ---- 49

Camp, Hon. John N. Happy, a Representative in Congress from the State of Oklahoma, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated March 8, 1972, enclosing letter from Hobart L. Jones, assistant superintendent, Guthrie public schools, Guthrie, Okla ---- 177

Caskey, Robert D., director, Federal programs, Gonzales, Independent School District, Gonzales, Tex., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated April 24, 1972 ---- 194

Courington, R. M., superintendent, Russellville city schools, Russellville, Ala., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated March 12, 1972 ---- 178

Dial, Louise, coordinator of library services, Derby Unified School District No. 260, Derby, Kans., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated April 25, 1972 ---- 193

Drewes, Henry superintendent of schools, Independent School District No. 173, Mountain Lake, Minn., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated April 25, 1972 ---- 195

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental material, etc.—Continued Page

Farnum, Forest T., superintendent, Franklin Northeast Supervisory Union, Richford, Vt., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated May 9, 1972 180
Frizzell, Charles, superintendent, Wayne Community School District, Corydon, Iowa, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated April 24, 1972 198
Gault, William, Jr., assistant superintendent of schools, Plymouth, Mass., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated May 8, 1972 181
Graham, Milton K., superintendent, Washington County public schools, Springfield, Ky., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated May 15, 1972 180
Hand, Dr. Charles, superintendent of schools, Ayer and Shirley, Mass., statement of 44
Hendrickson, Abner A., superintendent, the Joint County School System of Allmakee, Howard & Winneshiek Counties, Decorah, Iowa, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated April 25, 1972 201
Hockman, Mrs. Jean, Tacoma, Wash., letter to Congressman Floyd V. Hicks, dated March 18, 1972 179
Johnson, Robert G., coordinator of special programs, Gadsden city schools, Gadsden, Ala., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated April 24, 1972 194
Johnson, Walter E., Barrington, Ill., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated May 4, 1972 184
Ladd, Robert A., superintendent, Meigs County schools, Decatur, Tenn., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated April 28, 1972 196
Lampe, Thomas J., superintendent, Germantown Elementary School District No. 60, Germantown, Ill., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated April 24, 1972 197
Large, J. Neal, superintendent of schools, School District No. 1, Park County, Powell, Wyo., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated April 26, 1972 182
Laufenberg, Francis, associate superintendent for business and finance, Long Beach Unified School District:
Legal implications of the California Supreme Court's Decision in *Serrano* v. *Priest* 55
Prepared statement of 46
Law, Lyle B., superintendent, Morgan public schools, Morgan, Minn., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated April 26, 1972 193
Madeiros, Carles R., superintendent, Litchfield School District No. 79, Litchfield Park, Ariz., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated April 24, 1972 195
McCambridge, Ralph, superintendent of schools, Fostoria, Ohio, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated May 2, 1972 190
McCullouch, J. D., superintendent, and Donald Caldwell, assistant superintendent, Bay St. Louis public schools, Bay St. Louis, Miss., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated April 25, 1972 199
McKay, Hon. Gunn, a Representative in Congress from the State of Utah, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated March 22, 1972, enclosing letter from Jesse S. Brown, Layton, Utah 183
McLaurin, D. G., superintendent, Natchez Special Municipal Separate School District, letter to Chairman Perkins, dated April 27, 1972 197
Megel, Carl J., legislative director, AFL–CIO American Federation of Teachers:
"Money and the Marginal Child," article by David Selden 167
Prepared statement by 164
Nevin, J. Gordon, superintendent, Southmoreland School District, Scottdale, Pa., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated April 28, 1972 201
Oser, Dr. George, member, Houston Board of Education, statement of 16
Owens, Truman, superintendent, Muskegon Area Intermediate School District, Muskegon, Mich., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated April 28, 1972 196
Pace, Alton A., chairman, and John B. Gulley, superintendent, Covington City Schools, Covington, Tenn., letter to Congressman Ed Jones, dated May 9, 1972 191
Park, J. W., superintendent, Ohio County Schools, Hartford, Ky., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated April 25, 1972 199
Payzant, Thomas W., superintendent, School District of Springfield Township, Oreland, Pa., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated April 27, 1972 192

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental material, etc.—Continued Page

Pollard, Emigene, Edwards County School Libraries, Albion, Ill., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated May 5, 1972 185

Purvis, Claude, president, Kentucky Education Association, Louisville, Ky., statement by 175

Rasmussen, Harold A., director of secondary education, Richfield public schools, Richfield, Minn., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated May 9, 1972 184

Reid, Sidney, assistant superintendent, Berryessa Union School District, San Jose, Calif., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated May 17, 1972 182

Reuter, George S., Jr., superintendent, New Madrid County R–1 Enlarged School District, New Madrid, Mo., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated April 25, 1972 196

Scott, Donald, superintendent, Neenah Joint School District, Neenah, Wis., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated May 11, 1972 181

Turner, Joe L., superintendent, Olton Independent School District, Olton, Tex., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated April 26, 1972 191

Tydings, R. N., superintendent, Municipal Schools, Hobbs, N. Mex., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated May 2, 1972 179

Whitley, Thomas H., superintendent, and Lawrence C. Walker, assistant superintendent, Caswell County schools, Yanceyville, N.C., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated April 27, 1972 192

Yelverton, C. H., superintendent, Duplin County schools, Kenansville, N.C., letter to Chairman Perkins, dated April 27, 1972 200

OVERSIGHT HEARING ON ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1972

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 9:30 a.m., in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Carl D. Perkins (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Perkins, Pucinski, Brademas, Ford, Bell. Peyser, Quie, Dellenback, and Landgrebe.

Chairman PERKINS. The committee will come to order.

A quorum is present.

It is a great pleasure for me to welcome before the committee as our first witness one of our distinguished colleagues, Congressman Joel Broyhill. I know the great interest that Congressman Broyhill has always displayed and held fast to in the so-called impacted-area programs, Public Laws 815 and 874 of the 81st Congress; maintenance and operation and the school construction programs have played a great part in helping finance the school systems in your district.

The legislation was extended through, if I recall, June 30, 1973.

We are looking into all aspects of the general education program—I mean the categorical programs, such as Public Laws 815 and 874, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Mr. Pucinski next week will commence hearings on general education bills pending before the committee. We are hopeful that we can sometime later on this year enact a general aid-to-education bill, and certainly it is my hope that we will be able to extend and expand the impacted-area programs. I know these programs have been of tremendous benefit to the school systems throughout the Nation where we have had this so-called governmental impact in the past. The programs, to my way of thinking, have worked out well.

Congressman Broyhill, I am delighted to welcome you here this morning. I do want to state that on many occasions when we were in trouble on the House floor you gave the sponsors of the legislation invaluable assistance and we have always appreciated it. We are delighted to welcome you as our first witness today.

Proceed in any manner you prefer.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF VIRGINIA

Mr. BROYHILL. I feel I should quit now while I am ahead and just put my statement in the record.

Chairman PERKINS. I always thought you have done very well all through the years.

Mr. BROYHILL. I thank the chairman for his kind words and for the privilege of appearing before the committee this morning. Realizing that the committee does have a very heavy schedule, I would like to submit my statement for the record.

Chairman PERKINS. Without objection, the prepared statement will be inserted in the record.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF VIRGINIA

Mr. Chairman: It is a pleasure to appear before your Committee today in behalf of the continuation of programs authorized by Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, providing for aid to Federally impacted school areas.

As the Committee knows, these programs have been misunderstood and actively opposed by the last four Administrations. They have been singled out repeatedly in the press for carping criticism and such labels as "pork barrel" and "handouts". In 1970 the President of the United States vetoed the Education and Labor appropriations measure sent to him by Congress, and in so doing devoted much of his veto message to criticizing impact aid as a wasteful and unfair program which favors wealthy communities over the poor.

It is easy to see how these misunderstandings arose, Mr. Chairman, because ever since 1965 we have lumped impact aid in with all other elementary and secondary education programs, and in the process we have failed to label it as what it was originally intended to be and has in fact been ever since, a formula by which the Federal Government can make a payment in lieu of taxes to the communities in which it operates.

Whether or not we support the enactment of more and more legislation to take from the haves and give to the have nots, these programs were never intended to be that kind of social legislation. Enactment of these laws and their continued funding over the years has represented an acknowledgement on the part of Congress that the Federal Government has an obligation to the communities in which it operates comparable to that any private industry which operated in a similar manner would have.

I might say at this point that my own communities in Northern Virginia would fare much better financially if we could assess and tax all the federally owned property on the same basis it would be taxed if it were private industry. In Arlington County, for example, we have 4.6 square miles, or approximately 128 million square feet under Federal control. This is 18% of the total land area. Some of this land is extremely valuable, as is demonstated by the fact that land between the Pentagon and the Washington National Airport is valued at about $12 a square foot, and land in the Rosslyn complex not far away at more than $26 a square foot. However, if we estimated on the basis of 18% of all the Arlington County property and all types of zoning, then assumed a rock bottom price of $4.00 per square foot, the market value of government held property in Arlington would be $512,960,000, and if it were assessed at 40% of appraised value, or $205,000,000, annual revenue from real estate taxes alone would be a minimum of $7,851,500.

The impact aid programs enable the Federal Government to pay part of the cost of educating children of employees who work or live on these tax-free properties. But these payments fall far short of meeting the full obligation the Federal Government, as an employer and property owner, would assume were it privately owned and operated. Arlington County's share of impact aid for Fiscal 1971 is $1,853,268, roughly $6 million less than the County would receive in real estate taxes alone for comparable non-Federal property.

Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that after so many years of recognition by Congress that we do have an obligation to these communities, we must continue to defend it year after year from charges that it somehow discriminates against the poor of the Nation. I believe we made a grave mistake back in 1965 in not fighting much harder to prevent lumping impact aid in with other education programs your Committee considers from time to time, as we have made it a

little more difficult for critics to accept our explanation of its purpose. I have introduced and supported measures which would provide for direct Federal payments to communities in lieu of real property taxes, and I believe enactment of such legislation would remove once and for all the question of the purpose and equity of payment of these funds. But until such time as Congress acts favorably on an alternative proposal, I urge the Committee to continue and even to consider expanding payments under Public Laws 815 and 874 to more accurately reflect the revenue loss sustained by those communities in which the federal government operates on tax-free property.

Mr. BROYHILL. I think we should attempt to clarify what the original concept of the impact aid program was. I know the chairman of the committee was a Member of Congress at that time. I came to Congress right after the program was enacted. It was my understanding that while the use of the word "impact" recognized the sudden thrust of Federal operations in the communities, the main reason to justify the aid was the fact that the Federal Government was in these communities operating as an industry and that property had been taken off the tax rolls, which is generally the main source of revenue to support the school system in any community.

You can take any town, the town of Pittsburgh or any town, a principal industrial town, and you will find a major part of the tax revenue comes from the place where people work, not where they live, because the residences themselves are a dead loss to the community. In fact, the President has suggested another form of raising revenue in order to support the school systems of the country because residences alone certainly cannot do it.

So I think we should clarify and emphasize why we have the impacted aid program to start with; that is, there is a payment in lieu of taxes based on the fact that the Federal Government is there operating as an industry.

I urge that the committee do something to further clarify what the impact aid legislation, or Public Laws 815 and 874, is all about.

Chairman PERKINS. The gentleman is analyzing the situation correctly. I served on the subcommittee back in 1949, the subcommittee that drafted the original impact aid legislation, and we had in mind one thing. When the Federal Government came in, took over property, took it off the tax rolls, the local government was to be compensated for its loss of local revenue.

Go ahead, Mr. Broyhill.

Mr. BROYHILL. I am not talking about wasteland, Mr. Chairman, or park lands or property that is of no value taxwise to the communities. I am talking about productive property.

If that property were assessed at the same rate as other property in the community, averaging out assessment of residential and business property, we would receive six times more in Arlington County than we receive through Public Laws 815 and 874.

We should do something to clarify for not only this administration but future administrations that we are talking about a Federal obligation and not a handout or something of that sort.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I know that the committee has expressed its concern many times about the uncertainty as to whether the program is going to be continued or whether the appropriations are going to be made from year to year. Once we put a program on the books,

the communities get used to living with it, anticipate the funds coming in each year, and they set the budget accordingly.

Then when appropriations are cut back or there is a threat of not extending the program, they face a real problem trying to remain sound and efficient in preparing their budgets from year to year.

So if the committee can do something to eliminate the degree of uncertainty—there is nothing ever completely certain about what Congress will do from year to year, but I think we can make it more assured.

Third, in an effort to eliminate this constant criticism that rich communities are getting benefits from impacted aid programs and that we should direct it at communities where the need is greater. I say again it is an obligation. If it is an obligation, we cannot renege on an obligation just because we think the people to whom we own the obligation do not need it.

I think we should set this up as a permanent obligation that will be met from year to year, and then, when we come along with the other elementary and secondary education programs, more emphasis can be placed on the need of the community, what the community is doing for itself, what the sources of revenue happen to be, and maybe credit can be given to them or to the Federal Government for the impact aid funds that the community has received, so that the programs that should be based on need—and I think an elementary and secondary general education program should be—are funded on that basis. There is no point in feeding Federal funds to the wealthy communities at the same rate as the poor communities. But at the same time you could then take into consideration the needs of all communities, including those who benefit from the impacted aid program, to determine if they are indeed wealthy communities and do not need the benefits of Federal support for elementary and secondary education programs.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, instead of arguing year in and year out as to whether the wealthy communities or alleged wealthy communities are entitled to the benefits of impact aid, eliminate need entirely from future considerations of impact aid and make that a factor only in the consideration of the general elementary and secondary education program.

That would help to clarify this problem which I think should be clarified, and also to eliminate this degree of uncertainty which makes it extremely difficult for these communities to plan their budgets year in and year out, and have a sound, efficient, and orderly educational system.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me say to you, Mr. Broyhill, that, in my judgment, when the committee members read your testimony they will find that you have been most helpful to the committee. You have certainly pointed up the problems to the committee, and I am most hopeful that we can take action on them this year.

I want to thank you again for the support that you have always given the committee and the legislation. Chances are the bill will not be marked up for several months, but we will confer with you again from time to time and may call you back.

Mr. BROYHILL. Thank you very much.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, may I make a brief comment?

We appreciate very much, Mr. Broyhill, your being with us. Your advocacy on behalf of your constituents of this concept is well known. It has been very effective, and you do it well.

Let me just say very briefly that I, as one individual, strongly support the idea of advance funding and predictability. That is a large part of what you said. It is frustrating for a school district not to know what is going to happen. It is an impossible job when administrators are not able to call the shots a few months in advance, but are in the middle of a school year before they know what they are going to get in the way of school aid. Yet, too frequently we have done that.

I think Federal support for schools on an elementary and secondary as well as higher education level is vital. No community ever says it does not need more money, and you have talked in terms of the rich and the poor school districts. It does not matter whether you are talking about the wealthiest school district in the Nation, it will always look for additional funds if it sees them coming.

I read your testimony and listened to you again this morning, and I repeat you have done it well, defending the idea of Federal aid, not necessarily defending the present formula.

I think that is a very important distinction to make because there is a fundamental distinction between the idea of Federal aid—and I think it should be forthcoming—and a district like yours which has such a heavy involvement with the Federal Government. I think there is an obligation on the part of the Federal Government to contribute to schools. But that does not mean that the formula we have at the present time is the ideal formula. Once it is on the books it is difficult to change.

Some of us who want to support Federal aid are not of necessity prepared to defend the present formula. So I just wanted to be sure that you understood that particular point, and I do not really read you as contradicting that. I did not read in any part of your testimony—and I read it over while you were talking—an item-by-item defense of the present formula.

You have defended the principle, and I think you have done it ably and well. We appreciate your testimony very much this morning.

Chairman PERKINS. Congressman Broyhill, let me state that I personally feel that your congressional district, the people that you have represented so well, are very fortunate, especially from the viewpoint of the great support that you have given the schools. I share the concern as expressed by Congressman Dellenback that we should do something about the advance funding aspects that we enacted several years ago. We have never gotten the Appropriations Committee to go along. For 1 year they partially went along with us. But I am hopeful that we can eliminate some of these problems by timely authorization and timely funding, including advance funding. That is really one of the purposes of these hearings. You have been very helpful to the committee.

Our next witnesses are representatives of the National School Boards Association: Kenneth Buhrmaster, president, National School Boards Association; George Oser, Houston, Tex.; and Augustus Steinhilber, National School Boards Association.

STATEMENTS OF KENNETH E. BUHRMASTER, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION; DR. GEORGE OSER, BOARD OF EDUCATION, HOUSTON, TEX., INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT; AND DR. AUGUSTUS W. STEINHILBER, DIRECTOR OF FEDERAL AND CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS, NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION

Mr. STEINHILBER. Good morning, Mr. Chairman.

I have with me this morning the president of the National School Boards Association, Mr. Kenneth Buhrmaster, a banker by profession, from the Greenville, N.Y., area. Mr. Buhrmaster will speak specifically with respect to special revenue sharing.

I also have with me Dr. George Oser, past president of the Houston, Tex., Independent School District, and currently a member of that board and of the NSBA legislative committee. He will talk specifically with respect to some of the operations of current programs, and zero in on title I.

Chairman PERKINS. Without objection, all your prepared statements will be inserted in the record.

(The statements referred to follow:)

STATEMENT OF KENNETH E. BUHRMASTER, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION, ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, my name is Kenneth E. Buhrmaster, President of the National School Boards Association. I am accompanied by Dr. George Oser, Member, Houston, Texas, Independent School District, and Dr. August W. Steinhilber, Director of Federal and Congressional Relations of the Association. They will both be available to assist in answering your questions.

The National School Boards Association is the only major education organization representing school board members—who are in some areas called school trustees. Throughout the nation, approximately 84,000 of these individuals are Association members. These people, in turn, are responsible for the education of more than 95 percent of all the nation's public school children.

Currently marking its thirty-first year of service, NSBA is a federation of state school boards associations, with direct local school board affiliates, constituted to strengthen local lay control of education and to work for the improvement of education. Most of these school board members, like yourselves, are elected public officials. Accordingly, they are politically accountable to their constituents for both educational policy and fiscal management. As lay unsalaried individuals, school board members are in a rather unique position of being able to judge legislative programs, such as revenue sharing, purely from the standpoint of public education, without consideration to their personal professional interest. In so doing, this last April, at its national convention, the membership of the National School Boards Association voted to support the revenue sharing concept, as it had in past years, by adopting the following resolution:

"The National School Boards Association urges Congress to assist local school districts in meeting their responsibility to provide appropriate education for all public school children through general and/or special revenue sharing plans which directly provide funds for all types of public school districts. These funds should be distributed in a manner which gives due recognition to the educational needs, financial effort, and resources of the various school districts."

EASIER PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION AND CONSOLIDATION

Mr. Chairman, before addressing the specifics of the bill H.R. 7796, which is the subject of today's hearing, I would like to explore with you the merits of two major functions which the Special Revenue Sharing concept serves for school boards, in their efforts to make Federal programs work more effectively.

The first of these functions is to relieve school boards and their superintendents of some of the administrative effort which is currently required of them in the management of Federal education programs. Special Revenue Sharing sets out to accomplish this function through the consolidation of existing programs. In order to uncover what is at issue in discussing program administration, it might be helpful to consider the merits of simplifying the current system separately from the merits of consolidation as the means.

Today the delivery system of Federal education programs is far from simple. Indeed any school board which desires to take full advantage of the Federal effort in education must be in touch with some two dozen agencies which administer over 200 programs. This year in its testimony before the respective House and Senate Appropriation Subcommittees, the administration stated that Federal aid for state administration costs $115 million. Unfortunately, precise figures are not available as to how much state and local units are expending for this purpose, but we suspect the amount would be enormous. However, rather than dwelling on the question of how much is spent for administration and whether such sums are worthwhile commitments for the improvement of education, I will focus on certain of the inequities which have arisen because of these costs.

As you know, some programs channel Federal money directly to local school districts while others rely on the State education agency as an administrative intermediary.

Since most States boards of education are not directly involved in the direct Federal-local type of program, each school district must be its own grantsmanship watchdog. Accordingly, just to stay abreast of new opportunities—let alone to make the commitment of resources to apply for and followup on programs—many districts find that they must employ personnel to especially service this task. As expected, only the larger and wealthier districts can afford such liaison services—and hence fully participate in the Federal program. By so procedurally precluding most of the smaller and less wealthy school districts from realistic access to the direct Federal-local type of grant, the Federal Government is not just ignoring, but is contributing to the disparity of educational opportunity which exists from district to district.

Similarly, pursuant to programs which are operated through the State boards of education, disparities of opportunity among school districts are also created. While local awareness of programs is much better under this system as opposed to the direct Federal-local system, the quality of management varies from State to State. And this is true, even though several of the Federal programs provide money for State administration. The reason is that among States of unequal populations, the larger States have the advantage of economies of scale in program management since they receive more funds for administration from all sources. Even among States wherein population and wealth are equal, there are variations in program delivery since some States have proportionately fewer school districts than others. In such cases State-local liaison is easier not just because of the fewer numbers of districts to be serviced but because each district will be larger and hence have more revenue available to pursue Federal programs. What this all means is that some States will be able to take the initiative and advise every school district of all Federal programs—indeed perhaps even offer guidance—whereas in others the school districts must use their own resources and initiative to find out what programs are available and what procedures they must follow in order to apply for assistance.

In light of the foregoing, it is our opinion that the massiveness of—and lack of coordination within—the existing Federal program delivery system is giving rise to management costs which are too expensive for all districts and particularly prohibitive—hence unfair—to the smaller districts, which, ironically, are frequently the ones targeted for Federal relief. In seeking a feasible correction, I would like to turn to the notion of consolidation, which is the vehicle of special revenue sharing.

As we just saw, regardless of whether we are addressing the direct Federal-local type of program or those using the State agency as an intermediary, the twin administrative cost considerations for local school boards are (1) access to the system and (2) program management. Accordingly, my initial comments on consolidation will be in terms of these cost considerations.

On the question of access, the advantages of consolidation programs are at least somewhat self-evident. Suffice it to say that the fewer the number of

separate programs and the less the amount of information which must be communicated under each, the more feasible it is for Federal and State governments to reach—and to be reached by—every school district.

Similarly, we readily note that consolidation will reduce the cost of program management, hence resulting in a Federal effort which is both more economical and more equitable. As a rule once a school district is aware of a program, its inducement to apply for and manage that program will, in large part, bear a relationship to (a) the dollar amount and scope of the program and (b) the relative magnitude of these latter two factors compared to the administrative overhead involved. In this latter connection it should be remembered that the time which a superintendent spends in federal grantsmanship is discretionary and must be balanced against the mandatory responsibilities of operating a school system. Furthermore, the priority generally assigned to federal grantsmanship, especially for relatively small projects, is further diminished by the fact that success in being awarded a grant is uncertain. Given these factors, superintendents are often times discouraged from the outset when application procedures require extensive information gathering for programs of limited dollar amount. And this may be so even where the program would be important to the district involved. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, participation in the Federal arena is a luxury for many school systems, particularly for the smaller and poorer ones. On the other hand, through the consolidation of existing programs, superintendents will find fewer application forms to contend with, greater dollar amounts per program, as well as broader program scope.

As an aside, program consolidation would probably lead to a concommitent administrative consolidation within the Office of Education. Currently, apart from the difficulty of finding the right office to obtain information, review applications, etc., program users find that they must maintain contact with several offices, just, say, to handle one application. For example, an application to fund a vocational program for handicapped children might require separate review by the Office of the Commissioner, the Bureau of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education, and the Bureau of Education of the Handicapped. Assuming that such an organizational consolidation would occur, state and local liaison overhead costs into the Federal government would also be greatly reduced.

At this point, it may be asked, if the reduction of Administrative overhead is a principle which everybody strives for, and if consolidation is an effective means to accomplish that end, why then has this aspect of special revenue sharing surfaced as a major issue in the education community? The answer is with neither the principle of reducing administrative overburden nor the positive effectiveness of consolidation. Rather, it is with the importance which some observers assign to the offsetting effects of consolidation.

These observers believe that consolidation will result in a lower level of accounting, i.e., quality control, on the local level. They further state that there will be a reduction in data feedback to those people on the national level, including Committee staff, who are responsible for federal program design, and, to some degree they are probably right. Therefore, to the extent that administrative ease and Federal control are both necessary and exclusive, the real issue then becomes in locating the optimum balance point between the two. That is, we suggest that the value of the information and control which would be lost through consolidation should be weighed in light of the importance of reducing administrative overhead.

However before reaching the decision to trade off valuable Federal control, we would further suggest that current application forms and reporting requirements be reviewed to determine how much of the information which is presently collected is even necessary to assure satisfactory levels of program accounting and guidance. It might also be advisable to determine to what extent the current flow of paper is actually being used by the Administration and Committee staffs for those purposes.

As a final thought, perhaps the whole question of balancing program administration and control can be circumvented through the commitment of sufficient funds to program access and management at all three levels of government so that even the poorest district in the poorest of states will have the same opportunity to be aware of, apply for, and report on, every federal education program. However, we tend to think that the cost of preserving both equal program opportunity and tight administration is prohibitive in terms of the education which those funds could otherwise provide. Furthermore, in light of the origins of the

bill which we will be discussing shortly, it would appear self-evident that even the administrators of the Federal education effort agree that they are already gathering a lot of unnecessary information which just isn't used or at best provides only limited value.

OVERCATEGORIZATION AND PROGRAM FLEXIBILITY

Up until now, Mr. Chairman, we have been speaking of special revenue sharing as a means to ease the end user's overhead in terms of access to and management of Federal programs. As I mentioned at the outset, special revenue sharing also serves a second purpose which overlaps, but is separate and no less important than the first. Using program consolidation as its vehicle, special revenue sharing permits state and local educational agencies to have greater flexibility in the operation of categorical programs.

Again skeptics will surface who say discretion, not unlike ease of administration, leads to a deterioration of program quality and prevents adequate feedback for the program designers in Washington. Again, we do not believe that all federal controls should be abandoned. But, on the other hand, we likewise do not believe that there should be tight administrative oversight solely for the sake of oversight. Obviously there is a balance between the two which can produce the most effective and efficient educational use of federal revenues.

We do believe that federal categorical aid in special areas is necessary. Certainly when the cost of educating one handicapped child, for example, is sevenfold that of providing the standard education course, school boards would have great difficulty in furnishing those services even if more funds were available from the federal level. This is especially so since many school districts are inadequately funded for their standard programs.

However, there are dangers in overcategorization. When I say overcategorization, I refer to both the establishment of narrow subgoals within programs, as well as the establishment of separate programs which in terms of purpose should be under one general category. At this point I wish to briefly outline for you some of these dangers and again attempt to strike a balance point between the needs for federal and effective program delivery.

Since board members are fiscally accountable to their constituencies, they tend to approach categorical assistance very cautiously. For one thing there is little certainty that the Congress or Administration, as the case may be, will fund a particular program at a given level. Indeed, given the fact that appropriations for some programs are 100% of the authorized level and 0% for others, with fluctuations from year to year, expectations tend to be quite low. This is particularly true of discretionary programs wherein program goals and standards can change from year to year as well as the level of funding. Accordingly, school boards and their superintendents design their programs in a manner geared to hedge against these uncertainties. Specifically, the programs are designed apart from the "normal" operations of the system so they can be turned on, dimmed, or off depending on the level of funding. Perhaps the point can be clarified by example. The desegregation bill which was passed by the Senate this last Spring contains some six discretionary categories. School boards would be reluctant to inextricably weave an educational park program into their normal operations if they risk being caught without funds in the following year. Similarly, their hesitancy will even be greater to make that educational park program interdependent with, say, an educational T.V. program since Federal funds for that purpose are also uncertain. However, those who favor this degree of categorization argue that, to be effective, a program such as desegregation must contain subgoals which require very special uses of Federal funds. We reply that the degree of overcategorization found in legislation such as the desegregation bill is not going to produce well-coordinated programs and, ironically, they are not going to be integrated into the existing school program on anything but a temporary basis.

The same kind of arguments can be made about the various programs for the disadvantaged such as Title I, Upward Bound, Bilingual, Headstart, etc.

In either case we feel that local school districts would pursue the same kinds of special subprograms as under the existing system, but they would be relieved from the inhibiting factors which I just described.

A second danger in overcategorization and overregulation is that local school boards are denied the flexibility to accommodate the purposes of the program to the special needs of its pupils. Similarly, we can envision a school district wish-

ing to attain a quality integrated school system, in part, through the use of educational T.V. But suppose that the funds in that category are already committed. That district must then look to a program of secondary importance, but never one which is not established as a special category. Or, as an alternative the district may then decide to do without any special program although federal money is available.

Mr. Chairman, this, in a nutshell summaries our reasons for supporting the special revenue sharing concept as a means to reduce administrative overhead and to correct the limiting effects of over categorization.

H.R. 7796—INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Mr. Chairman, with this background in mind, I would like now to turn to HR 7796 the subject bill of today's hearing. By way of introduction I have an opening comment and then would like to list the issues of major concern which we have with HR 7796.

First, our comment is an expression of disappointment that the scope of the bill is limited to the state plan programs. While we are advised that some forty programs representing most of the federal education money are included within HR 7796 the severe cases of administrative overburden and program fragmentation will not be tended to if the direct Federal/local type of grant programs are not included as well.

Since the bill substantively effects major elementary and secondary programs, we would literally need days of hearings to fully examine in precise terms what the bill does and what its implications are for the present and future federal role in education. But since it is not feasible to so cover the bill, we will outline our major concerns with those provisions dealing with, the distribution formula, Impact Aid and Public Housing, State Advisory Councils, Local Appeals Procedure, Administration Under the Secretary, The Secretary's Discretionary Fund, and the Authorization of Appropriations.

DISTRIBUTION FORMULA

Section 4 provides for the "Allotment and Use of Shared Revenues." In this regard, we have two items of concern which hopefully will be given further study by the Administrations and the Congress.

Our first concern relates to the character of apportionment among the states. As you know, under Special Revenue Sharing such factors as the number of vocational or handicapped pupils would no longer be considered in making payments to the states. Rather, pursuant to a tripartite weighted formula, each state would share in one massive appropriation for elementary and secondary education according to its portion of school aged children from the general population, low income families, and federally connected families. While we are not opposed to a change in the basis for making payment, we need further information before we can support the precise formula which is chosen. Indeed, data should be furnished showing how much each state would receive at various levels of appropriations. Furthermore, 5–10 years projections should be made as to the number of students who will comprise each element of the formula. And, then, only after combining the two and comparing the results with current distribution trends will we be able to understand the implications of this formula in terms of state by state total dollar amounts.

The mystery of the formula is found in the interrelationship of its three elements. Children from low income families are weighed nearly twice as heavily as impact aid children and ten times as heavily as the general student population. Since HEW reports that there are 7.4 million children who are counted for Title I purposes as compared to 52 million plus in the general population and some 2 million in the impact program, it is immediately apparent that the precise manner in which low income children are counted becomes extremely important not only as to how much each state is eligible to receive *in toto* from the Federal Government, but also as to what portion thereof must be spent for Title I purposes. However, the bill does not define lower income children. In fact, the only definitional reference is found in section 20(9) which merely delegates the authority of defining low income family to the Secretary of HEW. Accordingly, the Secretary may, for example by administrative fiat eliminate the principle source of Title I assistance to the big cities by cutting off the 2.2 million AFDC children from the definition now in effect. Results of similar magni-

tude can be achieved by raising or lowering the low income factor. Mr. Chairman, we do not believe that a definition which can determine by millions of dollars how much, more or less, any state can receive and the purposes for which that money can be used (i.e., disadvantaged versus other programs) should be within the arbitrary control of the Administration.

Finally, given the far reaching effects of this legisaltion in terms of dollars and time, the Administration should be held accountable even beyond revealing state to state appropriations trends and how it is weighting of the formula to produce such trends. Specifically, it should be brought to task to explain its rationale, i.e., the merits, for placing the realtive weight which it chooses for each of the three elements. This is particularly important since the priority assigned to general aid, assistance for the disadvantaged, and the grouping of vocational, handicapped, and support service programs are directly linked, indeed controlled, by the relative weight given to the number of children from the low income, federally connected, and general population, respectively. Furthermore, unlike the current system wherein the priorities among programs can be shifted from year to year by proportionately increasing or decreasing the appropriations for each program, that cannot be done under HR 7796. As noted earlier, the bill has one appropriation under which the share for each program is fixed by formula. That is, a change in priorities among programs could only be brought about by an amendment of the legislation.

This takes me to our second concern with regard to the distribution formula, which relates to shifts in priorities among the grouping of Vocational, Handicapped, and Support Service Programs. For the purposes of discussion, Mr. Chairman, I beg your indulgence to briefly construct a model. Assume that for its first year of operation, Congress appropriates the same amount of money for elementary and secondary programs as it did this year. At this point, I refer to the Congressional Record of August 6 wherein at page S. 13444 (see table 1 at end of statement) it was reported that the combined appropriations for ESEA, Vocational Education, Education of the Handicapped and Impact Aid totaled $3.3 billion. Assume further that the Special Revenue Sharing formula would compute out to provide the same money for Title I of ESEA and Impact Aid as was appropriated for those purposes in Fiscal Year 1972. Then if these amounts, $1.5 billion and $612 million, respectively, are subtracted from the $3.3 billion total, the remaining $1.2 billion would be available for the three program grouping here at issue.

Turning again to the Special Revenue Sharing formula, we note that Section 4 distributes this $1.2 billion as follows: ⅓ to Vocational Education, 1/6 to Education of the Handicapped, and ½ to Support Service Programs. Therefore, pursuant to the level of the Fiscal Year 1972 Appropriation, the Special Revenue Sharing formula works out to $400 million for Vocational Education. Hence, the funding of that program would be cut by 31% or 176 million from its current level of $576 million. Under our model about $85 million would go to handicapped programs and some $91 million would go to support services. While in practice, the formula may not work out precisely this way, it will undoubtedly result in a shift of priorities among these three programs of approximately the same proportion. While we are not at present arguing the merits of this shift in priorities, we do wish to point out that they exist. And, as noted earlier, once enacted the priorities among programs can not be reshifted through the appropriations process since they are fixed by formula.[1]

IMPACT AID AND PUBLIC HOUSING

As you know Mr. Chairman, under the current impact aid formula the U.S. Government will make a per pupil payment to any school district for each federally connected child residing therein. The theory of the program is that the Federal government should compensate the school district for bringing such children to its schools, when in employing and/or housing their parents, the Federal government uses land which then becomes tax exempt. Or restated, the Federal government recognizes that since an average of one half of all school revenues comes from local property taxes, the affect of doing business

[1] While sec. 6 of the bill permits the States to transfer up to 30 percent of the funds from one of these programs to another, hence to some extent establishing their own priorities, the importance of the Federal priority should be underscored since it establishes the starting off points from which the States are then given limited latitude to add or subtract.

on tax exempt land within the district would cause an unfair burden to the community if some form of Federal compensation was not otherwise forthcoming. Since the theory of the program is one of compensation—not to achieve a special educational purpose—the payments are treated as general aid.

H.R. 7796 continues the theory of payments for 3a children, i.e., those who reside on federal property. Indeed, this aspect of the bill gives more realistic recognition of the financial burden created by the federal presence in that it would raise payments from 50 to 60% of the national per pupil expenditure. Unfortunately though, it does not continue to give recognition to those districts which make an extra effort to educate their children through the collection of local property tax revenues in amounts which produce a per pupil expenditure in excess of the national average. That is, it would no longer give the district the option of using ½ the state average per pupil expenditure or its local contribution rate, instead of one half the national average.

But, perhaps more importantly, while Section 4 preserves the method for making payments to the states for federally connected children who reside on other than federal property, i.e., 3b children, that section together with Section 5 works to change the theory of the payment at the local level. This is done in two ways: First the state may transfer up to a total of 30% of all impact aid funds to non impacted school districts. Since only 4,700 districts out of a total of approximately 18,000 districts are receiving impact funds, we would expect that the states would shift close to their 30% limit to the non impacted districts.

And second, the bill apparently permits the state to make a limitless shifting of general aid funds among impacted districts regardless of the number of federally connected children residing therein.

While we have no doubt that the states would, in their wisdom, distribute impact monies according to their determination of school district need, that would nonetheless change the theory of the payments, which is one of compensation. In effect the bill is saying that the Federal government can take tax producing land from a district and leave it to the states to decide whether just compensation therefor should be made to that district or be redistributed to another of its districts which may be more needy. We believe that the states should not be put into this position. We further believe that the Federal government should both pay its own way in areas where it conducts tax exempt business and, in addition, provide general assistance to those areas which need it. In this connection, the bill creates additional conceptual confusion in permitting impact funds to be distributed on the basis of need since the state allotment is pegged to the number of federally connected children therein, not the relative need of the districts within that state as compared to other states.

It should also be considered that the impact aid program does not belong in this bill in the first place. The purpose of the bill is to ease the Administration of categorical programs. Impact aid is not a categorical program but one of general aid. Under the current law districts need only count the number of their federally connected children and then a predictable payment is made under a precise formula. Nothing could be easier. This bill, on the other hand, complicates the program with uncertainty of payment and would result in an application procedure at the state level which would probably require districts to make detailed pleas of need.

Finally, we feel that the inclusion of Impact Aid, as written, within this bill interferes with the prerogatives of this Committee. Last year, Mr. Chairman, you personally spent much time studying the merits of the Impact program and various amendments thereto. It was then decided that this subject must be given more consideration before any final action could be taken. This bill appears to be side stepping that decision, as well as delegating to the states, the Federal perogative to establish an equitable formula for Federal compensation.

We were also disappointed to note that HR 7796 does not include payments to districts impacted by children residing on low rent public housing. Ironically, it would seem that if the Administration wanted to make impact aid payments on a basis which considered need, that it would have retained the public housing provision. Not only would the Federal government then be assisting our financially beleagured urban area but, the monies could be directly used to help pay the especially high cost of educating the disadvantaged children who reside therein.

STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL

Section 8 requires any state wishing to participate in the Special Revenue Sharing program to submit a plan for the distribution of funds to the Secretary

of HEW. This plan must be developed with the consultation of a State Advisory Council. The composition of that Council, prescribed by the provisions of Section 9 gives rise to two important issues.

First, the Council would include at least one representative of the non-public elementary and secondary schools of the state. While we are not opposed to church interests having a voice in determining how they are to expend federal funds in their schools, Advisory Council representation would give such interests a role which goes much beyond that. Indeed, religious groups would be considering questions of policy for all of education—including public education. Philosophically we are opposed to a parochial role of this kind of which is so deeply intertwined in the state and local operation of their educational function.

Our second comment regarding the State Advisory Council is that it does not specifically require school board representation thereon. Since it is the local school boards who bear the practical responsibility for educating our children, we would hope that this Council, which has as its responsibility the giving of advice and making reports on general education policy, would draw on insights of a school board member in its own decision making process.

APPEAL PROCEDURE

In a somewhat similar vein, we note that local school boards do not have any right to appeal to the state and/or HEW to either challenge the merits of the state plan or the equities of any financial distribution thereunder. While we agree that effective education policy and administration requires a strong state role in program development and oversight we also feel that the denial of an appeal procedure to local boards goes too far. Or restated, we are asking that the Council be made accountable to the local working level.

ADMINISTRATION

Under H.R. 7796, the responsibility for administering the Special Revenue Sharing program rests with the Secretary of HEW, rather than the Commissioner of Education. Mr. Chairman, we are strongly opposed to this designation for several reasons.

First, in part, our rationale for embracing the Special Revenue Sharing concept is that it reduces administrative overburden. Experience shows that programs operated at the Secretary's level produces the antithetical result. For example, the Head Start program is within the Office of the Secretary. Rather than managing it under Title I, the Secretary's office treats it as a special unit within HEW. Consequently, school boards now have one more office to find and establish liaison with, another set of regulations and guidelines to become familar with, another set of application and reporting procedures to comply with, etc. This provision is not merely self defeating in terms of the goals of Special Revenue Sharing, but promises to deepen the existing administrative nightmare to the extent that *all* Office of Education programs would then be subject to this organizational fragmentation.

This takes us to my second point. For several years now, NSBA has been urging the Congress and the President to assign a higher Federal priority to education through the establishment of a Department of Education. Until recently when members of this Committee and the Committee on Government Operations actively took the initiative in pursuing this goal, we have had to seek comfort with the thought that at least the Office of Education operates as a self contained, identifiable unit in the management of major education programs, including the various Titles under ESEA, the Vocational Education Act, Education of the Handicapped, and the Federally Affected Areas Program, etc. Therefore, we can only regard the shift of responsibility for administering these programs from the Commissioner to the Secretary as an effort to effect both a long term downgrading of education's priority as well as to erode the sense of identity which the education community has with the Commissioner's office.

DISCRETION

Section 11 of the bill provides that the Secretary may retain 10% of the appropriations for additional grants to the states. Based on last year's appropriations of $3.3 billion, the Secretary would then have a fund of $330 million. The only limitation placed upon the expenditure of this money is that it be used for activities "which are designed to further the achievement of national policy objectives in the field of education."

Proponents of Section 11 will argue that since a 10% discretionary fund is normal for federal education programs, this amount really does not exceed the current discretionary level. Furthermore, they will argue that the grouping of such funds into one pot should not be objectionable, even though greater discretion will result thereby. The reason is that this would merely be a consolidation of the administration's programs which are a part of and hence parallels the consolidation of the state plan programs.

However, we feel that this reasoning avoids an analysis of the substantive merits of such a discretionary fund. The purpose of the Special Revenue Sharing plan is to ease the administrative burden of state and local governments in the management of federal programs. We fail to see how the creation of a general slush fund will advance that purpose. Indeed, it would appear that the enactment of such a proposal would be an open invitation to the wealthier school districts to expand their grantsmanship programs.

Moreover, we have always been wary of discretionary programs because of the potential they carry for political chicanery. Our past fears in this regard, real as they have been, are infitesimal by comparison to the implications of a $330 million plus fund which may be distributed without restriction or withheld at the whim of the Administration.

In this regard, the Secretary's discretionary fund is not analagous in structure to the consolidation of the state grant programs. While Special Revenue Sharing gives the states wider latitude than they now enjoy, it still defines program goals, dollar limits, requires state plans, provides for compliance to federal guidelines and regulations, etc. The Secretary's fund is not subject to any such conditions or accountability.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 3 of the bill provides that Congress shall provide "such sums as may be necessary for carrying out this Act." We have generally been opposed to authorizing language which does not specify a dollar amount. And such is the case now. We believe that a bill of this scope, nearly the whole federal commitment to elementary and secondary education, should define both the financial needs of education and the federal objective or target in response thereto. By excluding such figures, the bill, in effect, shifts to the Appropriations Committee, a function which we prefer to have performed under the expertise of this committee.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, we fully applaud the President for recognizing administrative problems which confront school boards in the management of Federal programs.

But, as desirous as we are to seek the enactment of a special revenue sharing plan, we will not embrace any proposal until all questions pertaining to the distribution formula are resolved. However, even should the formula contained in HR 7796 prove to be acceptable, we are absolutely opposed to the enactment of this bill because of (1) its treatment of the Impact Aid including Public Housing Programs, (2) its inclusion of non public school representation on the State Advisory Council and its failure to provide for local school board representation thereon (3) its failure to provide local school boards with a procedure to challenge state plans and financial distributions made thereunder (4) and its failure to state a financial goal in the authorization of appropriations.

Furthermore, while we recognize the need for a discretionary fund, we urge that controls thereon be written into the legislation.

TITLE 1.—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF EDUCATION, FISCAL YEAR 1972 BUDGET

Appropriation	Fiscal year 1971		Fiscal year 1972					
	Authorization [1]	Appropriation	Authorization [1]	President's budget	House allowance	Department appeal	Senate allowance	Appropriation
Elementary and secondary education	$4,560,406,068	$1,915,968,000	$4,665,338,590	$1,855,278,000	$1,822,218,000	$1,857,278,000	$2,146,885,000	$1,993,278,000
School assistance in federally affected areas	1,018,295,000	550,675,000	1,129,690,000	440,040,000	607,580,000	440,040,000	677,620,000	612,620,000
Emergency school assistance	[2]	74,853,000		[3]	[4]	[4]	[4]	[4]
Proposed legislation	500,000,000	425,000,000	1,000,000,000	1,000,000,000	[3]	[4]	[4]	[4]
Education for the handicapped	371,500,000	105,000,000	436,309,000	110,000,000	115,000,000	110,000,000	116,500,000	115,750,000
Vocational and adult education	1,152,311,455	501,357,455	1,238,561,455	476,073,455	565,203,455	482,323,455	609,573,455	576,188,455

[1] Amounts include specific authorizations only.
[2] Indefinite.
[3] Not considered due to lack of authorizing legislation.
[4] Proposed supplemental.

STATEMENT OF DR. GEORGE OSER, MEMBER, HOUSTON BOARD OF EDUCATION, HOUSTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

To the members of the committee: For many months, nay, years, you have heard in presentation after presentation the details of the financial crisis faced by public education in the United States. This crisis, current and future, is well documented, and it seems as you look across the nation today that many forces are being brought to bear on the solution of this crisis from the State Supreme Court of California to the Fleishman Committee Reports of New York to the Governor's Committee on Educational Reform in the State of Texas. I am not here today to expand upon the information that you already have at hand or to dwell in more depth on those particulars. Instead, I would like to deal with a more pervasive problem, a problem whose fingers reach into all of the areas of school finance, school problems, the problem of control—local and otherwise. In order that my comments not remain in the philosophical realm, I would like to particularize them by a discussion of the Title I Program—what has been expected, what it has done, and what I see as its future requirements.

First of all, Title I has been expected, very simply, to perform miracles. It's somewhat akin to the hope that ten cents for a cup of coffee given to a person with no other financial resources will turn that person into a corporation executive three hours hence. Title I has had a hope of providing adequate education financial support for youngsters who need that support, but it has attempted to do a tremendous task with miniscule funds.

Across the nation and in Texas, we have something like $150 per year per student in Title I funds. In Houston, Texas, this $150 brings our per-pupil expenditures for youngsters in the Houston Independent School District in the Title I target schools approximately up to the national average of per-pupil expenditures throughout the nation. In New York City, the Title I addition in funds does not even bring the total per-pupil expenditures up to the state average. In addition to the small absolute amount of funds available for Title I youngsters, the Title I Program must bear an additional burden of providing survival services—food, clothing, medical and dental care. So on this pittance dedicated to youngsters of great need we have put the combined burdens of educational excellence and survival services, a burden which it is impossible for Title I funds to bear as they are currently funded.

Let's look for a moment and see what Title I has done. In Houston, Texas, just a few years ago, members of the Board of Education were publicly saying that there were no hungry children in Houston. Today, nearly 50,000 are fed hot lunches daily from the combined funds of Title I and the Department of Agriculture. Medical and dental care is provided to youngsters numbering approximately 30,000 in twenty-seven schools in Houston. We are currently exploring the possibility of providing clothing for the youngsters who have that need. One can talk about educational need, but until the youngster is in school, clothed and fed, one may as well forget the educational need because the educational system is not going to reach that youngster. So we in Houston feel a basic commitment to provide these kinds of survival services. We provide them from Title I funds because currently those are the only funds available to us for providing these services. In addition, part of our Title I funds are used for what are nominally called "cultural enrichment programs." These programs provide the experiences for youngsters they would not otherwise have because of the parents' inability to pay for transportation to areas of interest throughout the city—the museums, zoos, theatres. We feel this is an important part of our program but, again, these are programs that drain resources from the hard, substantive educational programs. These monies should be available from other sources beyond the Title I sources. Our heaviest emphasis in Houston in Title I funding is in the area of substantive, what I call hard, educational programs. Our administrative staff and the Board of Education is dedicated to the principle that our job, first and foremost, is providing excellence in education for every youngster in Houston. Consequently, all funds, be they local funds, state or federal funds, are funneled into programs of substantial educational impact.

In Houston, for example, approximately $2,000,000 of our Title I funds, or about half the total Title I allocation, is used in experimental reading programs. In nine elementary schools we have the exciting LEIR Program; in nine schools, the productive BRL Program; in nine schools, the Harcourt-Brace-Jovanovich Series, which attempts to bridge the cultural gap that previous reading programs have not. We think this is where the emphasis should be in the use of

Title I funds, but it is very difficult for us to proivde the necessary survival services, the necessary cultural enrichment programs, and these substantive educational programs in a way that fits the need of the youngsters of our community at the current level of funding. I would strongly oppose any efforts on the part of Congress or the administration in diminishing the dollars available in the Title Programs. In fact, I would press strongly for great expansion of these programs so that these necessary services could be provided in a more meaningful way to youngsters across the nation.

Educators today are agreed that educational funding, in order to have an impact, must reach what they have termed "a critical mass." It takes a certain amount of money before one can overcome the inertia of the situation, before one can make progress in bettering the educational environment. I don't believe the Title I funds in the amount they are currently distributed has much of a chance of overcoming this inertia, of making an impact, because it does not reach a critical mass.

To those critics who say Title I has failed, I say hogwash. Title I has barely been tried. Whatever alternative funding patterns are devised by Congress or the administration, I would urge that protection be given to the categorical programs currently in force and that more dollars be directed to supporting these programs.

Let me move now from a cursory discussion of Title I into some comments concerning control. One of the most overworked terms by members of boards of education, Congressmen, members of the administration are the words "local control." For the most part, these words are merely a demogogic artifice for saying something else. There are no federal strings on education programs, such as the Title programs, that we in Houston cannot live with. There are no strings that we find so burdensome that we would desire to have those strings removed. In fact, we urge the Congress to maintain the kinds of controls that guarantee accountability, that guarantee that federal funds which are our tax dollars be spent in a constitutional fashion. We demand that the national priorities be fulfilled in the guidelines for expenditure of these funds.

Local control should not mean the boards of education have the freedom to violate Constitutional dictates. Last year, Senator Mondale documented enumerable cases of the results of weak controls in the federal program of Emergency School Assistance. We do not want to see those sorts of things repeated.

It is strange that those who speak so strongly for local control often violate that very principle in the same breath. Recently, Vice President Agnew on the second of three televised interviews with the press spoke about the administration's opposition to the Child Develoment Act. President Agnew, I would suppose, is one who could be put in the camp of strong supporters of local control. Yet, when queried about the administration's opposition to day care centers, he said that he felt that mothers would take advantage of these centers if they were available. And, he didn't feel that it was proper that mothers would be able to take advantage of these centers and not fulfill their motherly duties. That is the kind of stance that has beclouded the issue of control. On the one hand, the proponents say, "We want local control"; on the other hand, they formulate legislation which disallows any kind of local control.

Similarly, on the issue of federal funding of transportation. The loudest proponents for local control are the first to say there shall be no federal moneys available for the transportation of youngsters. Local districts, under court order, are currently out of local funds providing that transportation, and local districts would like to have the flexibility to search for federal or local funds at their own discretion and not be boxed in by those so-called proponents of local control who in fact attempt to make decisions for the local boards at the national level.

Let me move to the areas of control that I think are less clouded, the practical areas of control, the areas that we face in the day-to-day operations of school districts in this nation. There has recently been in the case of Model Cities and in proposed legislation to do with the general revenue sharing a movement toward the funneling of federal funds to local agencies other than school districts, funds which ultimately are used in the educational system. There have been serious practical problems, mind you, not basic differences in philosophy between administrative units, but practical difficulties in dealing with funding. The problem is particularly acute where the local education agencies are independent, fiscal entities. Of the fifty large school districts, thirty-seven of those

districts, like my own district in Houston, are fiscally independent school districts. By State status, and State Constitutional mandate, these districts have been created as independent bodies and, as such, are responsible for the expenditures of funds. Whenever we receive funds from a local agency, such as a municipality, and expend those funds for educational programs, we have to pass those funds through our normal accounting procedures. For districts our size and phase lag, the system lag, the time it takes for processing, Board approval, administrative review, is approximately thirty days. When that time is coupled with the time for municipality's approval processes, he total time is approximately doubled to two months. If there are any problems along the way, if for example the City Council or the School Board have some questions that require modification of the proposal, the process can take many months.

Let me cite a particular instance. A program proposed by the Houston Independent School District to be funded by Model Cities was with the Ongoing Education of Pregnant Girls—a program of critical need in the Houston School District. We made the proposal in July of 1970 and did not receive from the City of Houston a letter to proceed until April 23, 1971, when there was only a five-week period of the school remaining for implementation of this program. There was no particular problem with the City's approval of this program nor the School District's, but needed modifications in the program, location sites, funding levels, etc., took three-quarters of a year to obtain final approval processing. The control that is involved is of utmost necessity, but the very fact that it must pass through all these control agencies limits the speed with which we can implement programs. The problem in this process is that controllers whose duty it is to approve payment of bills only if they meet their interpretation of the mandates of the law, local, state and federal, is that there are always variations in interpretation and, hence, considerable amounts of time are used in resolving these differences in interpretation. If we want systems that efficiently deliver education to youngsters, then we must do so through a single controlling agency. Hence, I would urge this committee, when it is considering alternative funding procedures to those currently adopted, to seriously consider the practical problems and that these funds be given directly to school districts for their use in the design of educational programs that meet the local needs.

There is a facet of control, a sensitive area, one that is probably as politically landmined as the discussion of local control and that is the role of decision making with respect to program funding.

Unfortunately, many school districts throughout this nation have excluded meaningful involvement of parents in decisions concerning the educational programs of their youngsters. In order to correct this imbalance, federal programs have encouraged considerable involvement of parents in that decision making. I stand strongly for parental involvement in the operation of the schools that provide services to the youngsters of those parents, but I believe that we must carefully assess the role that parents, professional administrators, and elected trustees must play in order that we bring about the result that we jointly desire. Parents are not skilled in designing educational programs. They are skilled and in fact are the only people skilled in assessing the needs of their youngsters. Board of Trustees are elected officials representing the public in making educational and financial decisions and are accountable to that public for those decisions. They are also constrained by the requirements of State and Federal Constitutions, and State and Federal statutes as well as local ordinances.

Parents, professional educators, and school trustees must maintain these areas of expertise if we are to produce a product which meets the needs of the youngsters. We must carefully distinguish between educational programs which require expertise in program design and development from welfare programs which are designed to meet the needs of unemployment. In welfare programs, involvement at the decisionmaking level is an important component of the overall program goals, but in education we must make such that the parental involvement is specific to defining the needs of the youngsters, allowing room for the professional administrators to design the program and delivery system to meet those needs. If, in fact, the system is designed and implemented in this fashion, we bring to bear community support for change, for educational innovation which is much needed in our schools. This combined effort of parents, school administrators and elected trustees will not only devise better plans, but will be able to in fact implement those plans, because of the broad base of support established by joint decisionmaking.

Lastly, I would like to touch upon another kind of control. It is a control that comes from our knowledge of what is effective. Most of the real control that exists in educational decision making is control based upon constraints, legal constraints, financial constraints, constraints of our knowledge about how youngsters learn and grow. We need to make sure that in our national program of educational funding that there be a flexibility in that programming which allows for modifications to meet the needs as the constraints change.

Let me specifically talk about what has been talked about much in the last few years, cultural enrichment programs. As I mentioned earlier, we in Houston engage in cultural enrichment programs, but believe that it is much more difficult to see benefit from these sorts of soft educational programs than it is from the harder more specific educational programs such as the reading programs we are currently funding under Title I. I would like to recount for you an instance that happened in Houston about a year ago when for the first time a number of youngsters in a cultural enrichment program were transported across the city to a music theater to watch a performance of a local group and then to respond to that performance. The youngsters had just returned from the theater and their responses were being taped for further analysis by the teachers in order to make the program even more meaningful the next go-round.

One of the youngsters was asked what impressed him most about this program and, mind you, he had just gotten back from seeing an entertaining theater production of a program content that would have been interesting to youngsters. His comment was that the most impressive thing that day was a five-story parking garage that he happened to notice as he was being transported along one of the freeways in Houston to the Music Theater. This little anecdote exemplifies what educators are finding out about "cultural enrichment." They are finding that cultural enrichment is not necessarily a specific experience such as a museum trip, a theater trip, but it is relating, observing, dealing with all of the stimuli that stream into a youngster's consciousness. It is very difficult to structure experiences so that they are, by their very nature, enriching experiences. Explicitly then as educators' ideas change as to what is beneficial for youngsters' education, which of course in the broadest terms is his enrichment, we should make certain that there are no immovable federal constraints upon shifting educational dollars from what were previously termed cultural enrichment programs to hard substantive educational programs. That is what I mean by local control.

In summation, I urge this committee to give serious consideration to the maintenance and expansion of the Title programs which have served this nation's children so well. I, secondly, urge this committee, if it is to consider other funding means to offset the serious financial crisis that faces our schools, that they do so in a manner that provides for efficient delivery of educational services directly to the recipients, the youngsters, and that in those funding techniques that there be no immovable constraints that would prevent local education agencies from using those funds to the maximum educational benefit of the youngsters involved. In your deliberations, I plead that you give careful examination to the cries of no strings and the cries of local control, to look behind those words for what they really mean so that the legislation that results will truly meet the needs of youngsters throughout our great country whose future depends so intimately upon your decisions. Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. You may proceed.

Mr. BUHRMASTER. Thank you. I would like to summarize the statement that you say will be in the record, and of course both Dr. Oser and Dr. Steinhilber will be able to assist in answering any questions that you may present to me after we conclude.

I just want you to know that the National School Boards Association is really the only major organization that represents school board members, and we represent some 84,000 members in the country who have under their charge some 95 percent of the public-school children of the United States.

Most of our school board members, like yourselves, are elected officials. Accordingly, we are politically accountable to our constituents

for not only educational policy but for the fiscal management of our school district.

As unsalaried individuals, as lay members of the community, I think we are well able to judge the legislative programs that are presented, and particularly a program such as revenue sharing, purely from the standpoint of education; particularly we want you to understand that we have no personal professional interest in this and look upon it much in the same light as you do.

At the recent national convention our organization voted to support the revenue-sharing concept again as it has in the years past.

Before I address myself to the specifics of H.R. 7796, I would like to explore with you the merits of two major functions which the special revenue-sharing concept serves for school districts in their efforts to make the Federal programs work more effectively.

The first of these functions is to relieve school boards and their superintendents of some of the administrative effort which is currently required of them in the management of these educational programs.

Special revenue sharing sets out to accomplish this function through the consolidation of existing programs.

Today the delivery system of Federal education programs is far from simple. Indeed, any school board which desires to take full advantage of the Federal effort in education must be in touch with some two dozen agencies that administer some 200 programs.

As you know, some programs channel Federal money directly to local school districts while others rely on the State education agency as an administrative intermediary.

Since most State boards of education are not directly involved in the direct Federal-local type of program, each school district must be its own grantsmanship watchdog. Accordingly, just to stay abreast of new opportunities—let alone to make the commitment of resources to apply for and follow up on programs—many districts find that they must employ personnel to especially service this task.

As expected, only the larger and wealthier districts can afford such liaison services—and hence fully participate in the Federal program. By so procedurally precluding most of the smaller and less wealthy school districts from realistic access to the direct Federal-local type of grant, the Federal Government is not just ignoring but is contributing to the disparity of educational opportunity which exists from district to district.

Similarly, pursuant to programs which are operated through the State boards of education, disparities of opportunity among school districts are also created. While local awareness of programs is much better under this system as opposed to the direct Federal-local system, the quality of management varies from State to State. And this is true, even though several of the Federal programs provide money for State administration.

The reason is that, among States of unequal populations, the larger States have the advantage of economies of scale in program management since they receive more funds for administration from all sources.

Even among States wherein population and wealth are equal, there are variations in program delivery since some States have proportionately fewer school districts than others. In such cases, State-local liaison is easier not just because of the fewer numbers of districts to be

serviced but because each district will be larger and hence have more revenue available to pursue Federal programs.

What this all means is that some States will be able to take the initiative and advise every school district of all Federal programs—indeed, perhaps even offer guidance—whereas in others the school districts must use their own resources and initiative to find out what programs are available and what procedures they must follow in order to apply for assistance.

It is our opinion that the massiveness of, and lack of coordination within, the existing Federal program delivery system is giving rise to management costs which are too expensive for all districts and particularly prohibitive, hence unfair, to the smaller districts, which ironically are frequently the ones targeted for Federal relief.

In seeking a feasible correction, I would like to turn to the notion of consolidation, which is the vehicle of special revenue sharing.

As we just saw, regardless of whether we are addressing the direct Federal-local type of program or those using the State agency as an intermediary, the twin administrative cost considerations for local school boards are (1) access to the system and (2) program management. Accordingly, my initial comments on consolidation will be in terms of these cost considerations.

On the question of access, the advantages of consolidating programs are at least somewhat self-evident. Suffice it to say that the fewer the number of separate programs and the less the amount of information which must be communicated under each, the more feasible it is for Federal and State governments to reach, and to be reached by, every school district.

Similarly, we readily note that consolidation will reduce the cost of program management, hence resulting in a Federal effort which is both more economical and more equitable. As a rule, once a school district is aware of a program, its inducement to apply for and manage that program will, in large part, bear a relationship to (*a*) the dollar amount and scope of the program and (*b*) the relative magnitude of these latter two factors compared to the administrative overhead involved.

In this latter connection it should be remembered that the time which a superintendent spends in Federal grantsmanship is discretionary and must be balanced against the mandatory responsibilities of operating a school system. Furthermore, the priority generally assigned to Federal grantsmanship, especially for relatively small projects, is further diminished by the fact that success in being awarded a grant is uncertain.

Given these factors, superintendents are oftentimes discouraged from the outset when application procedures require extensive information gathering for programs of limited dollar amount. And this may be so even where the program would be important to the district involved.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, participation in the Federal arena is a luxury for many school systems, particularly for the smaller and poorer ones. On the other hand, through the consolidation of existing programs, superintendents will find fewer application forms to contend with, greater dollar amounts per program, as well as broader program scope.

Until now we have been speaking of special revenue sharing as a means to ease the end user's overhead in terms of access to and management of Federal programs. As I mentioned at the outset, special revenue sharing also serves a second purpose which overlaps, but is separate from and no less important than the first.

Using program consolidation as its vehicle, special revenue sharing permits State and local educational agencies to have greater flexibility in the operation of categorical programs.

We do believe that Federal categorical aid in special areas is necessary. Certainly when the cost of educating one handicapped child, for example, is sevenfold that of providing the standard education course, school boards would have greater difficulty in furnishing those services even if more funds were available from the Federal level. This is especially so since many school districts are inadequately funded for their standard programs.

However, there are dangers in overcategorization. When I say "overcategorization," I refer to both the establishment of narrow subgoals within programs, as well as the establishment of separate programs which in terms of purpose should be under one general category.

The degree of overcategorization found in legislation such as the desegregation bill is not going to produce well-coordinated programs, and ironically they are not going to be integrated into the existing school program on anything but a temporary basis.

A second danger in overcategorization and overregulation is that local school boards are denied the flexibility to accommodate the purposes of the program to the special needs of their pupils.

Mr. Chairman, this in a nutshell summarizes our reasons for supporting the special revenue-sharing concept as a means to reduce administrative overhead and to correct the limiting effects of overcategorization.

With this background in mind, I would like now to turn to H.R. 7796, the subject bill of today's hearing. By way of introduction, I have an opening comment and then would like to list the issues of major concern which we have with H.R. 7796.

First, our comment is an expression of disappointment that the scope of the bill is limited to the State plan programs. While we are advised that some 40 programs representing most of the Federal education money are included within H.R. 7796, the severe cases of administrative overburden and program fragmentation will not be tended to if the direct Federal-local type of grant programs are not included as well.

We will outline our major concerns with those provisions of the bill dealing with the distribution formula, impact aid and public housing, State advisory councils, local appeals procedure, administration under the Secretary, the Secretary's discretionary fund, and the authorization of appropriations.

The distribution formula, section 4, provides for the "allotment and use of shared revenues." In this regard, we have two items of concern which hopefully will be given further study by the administration and the Congress.

Our first concern relates to the character of apportionment among the States. As you know, under special revenue sharing such factors

as the number of vocational or handicapped pupils would no longer be considered in making payments to the States. Rather, pursuant to a tripartite weighted formula, each State would share in one massive appropriation for elementary and secondary education according to its portion of school-age children from the general population, low-income families, and federally connected families.

Indeed, data should be furnished showing how much each State would receive at various levels of appropriations. Furthermore, 5--10 year projections should be made as to the number of students who will comprise each element of the formula.

And then, only after combining the two, and comparing the results with current distribution trends, will we be able to understand the implications of this formula in terms of State-by-State total dollar amounts.

The mystery of the formula is found in the interrelationship of its three elements. Children from low-income families are weighted nearly twice as heavily as impact aid children and 10 times as heavily as the general student population.

However, the bill does not define lower-income children. In fact, the only definitional reference is found in section 20(9), which merely delegates the authority of defining low-income family to the Secretary of HEW. Accordingly, the Secretary may, for example, by administrative fiat eliminate the principal source of title I assistance to the big cities by cutting off the 2.2 million AFDC children from the definition now in effect.

Results of similar magnitude can be achieved by raising or lowering the low-income factor.

Mr. Chairman, we do not believe that a definition which can determine by millions of dollars how much, more or less, any State can receive and the purposes for which that money can be used—that is, disadvantaged versus other programs, should be within the arbitrary control of the administration.

Finally, given the far-reaching effects of this legislation in terms of dollars and time, the administration should be held accountable even beyond revealing State-to-State appropriation trends and how it is weighting the formula to produce such trends. Specifically, it should be brought to task to explain its rationale—that is, the merits for placing the relative weight which it chooses for each of the three element.

Unlike the current system wherein the priorities among programs can be shifted from year to year by proportionately increasing or decreasing the appropriations for each program, that cannot be done under H.R. 7796.

This takes me to our second concern with regard to the distribution formula, which relates to shifts in priorities among the grouping of vocational, handicapped, and support service programs.

Asume that for its first year of operation, Congress appropriates the same amount of money for elementary and secondary programs as it did this year, $3.3 billion.

Assume further that the special revenue-sharing formula would compute out to provide the same money for title I of ESEA and impact aid as was apropriated for those purposes in fiscal year 1972.

Then if these amounts, $1.5 billion and $612 million, respectively, are subtracted from the $3.3 billion total, the remaining $1.2 billion would be available for the three-program grouping here at issue: one-third to vocational education, one-sixth to education of the handicapped, and one-half to support service programs.

Therefore, the special revenue-sharing formula works out to $400 million for vocational education. Hence, the funding of that program would be cut by 31 percent or $176 million from its current level of $576 million.

About $85 million would go to handicapped programs, and some $91 million would go to support services. While in practice the formula may not work out precisely this way, it will undoubtedly result in a shift of priorities among these three programs of approximately the same proportion.

Once enacted, the priorities among programs cannot be reshifted through the appropriations process since they are fixed by formula.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, under the current impact aid formula, the U.S. Government will make a per-pupil payment to any school district for each federally connected child residing therein.

H.R. 7796 continues the theory of payments for 3(a) children—that is, those who reside on Federal property. Indeed, this aspect of the bill gives more realistic recognition of the financial burden created by the Federal presence in that it would raise payments from 50 to 60 percent of the national per-pupil expenditure.

But perhaps more importantly, section 5 works to change the theory of the payment at the local level. This is done in two ways: first, the State may transfer up to a total of 30 percent of all impact aid funds to nonimpacted school districts. And second, the bill apparently permits the State to make a limitless shifting of general aid funds among impacted districts regardless of the number of federally connected children residing therein.

In effect, the bill is saying that the Federal Government can take tax-producing land from a district and leave it to the States to decide whether just compensation therefor should be made to that district or be redistributed to another of its districts which may be more needy. We believe that the States should not be put into this position.

It should also be considered that the impact aid program does not belong in this bill in the first place. The purpose of the bill is to ease the administration of categorical programs. Impact aid is not a categorical program but one of general aid. Under the current law, districts need only count the number of their federally connected children and then a predictable payment is made under a precise formula. Nothing could be easier.

Finally, we feel that the inclusion of impact aid, as written within this bill, interferes with the prerogatives of this committee. Last year, Mr. Chairman, you personally spent much time studying the merits of the impact program and various amendments thereto. It was then decided that this subject must be given more consideration before any final action could be taken. This bill appears to be sidestepping that decision.

We were also disappointed to note that H.R. 7796 does not include payments to districts impacted by children residing in low-rent public housing.

STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL

Section 8 requires any State wishing to participate in the special revenue-sharing program to submit a plan for the distribution of funds to the Secretary of HEW. This plan must be developed with the consultation of a State advisory council. The composition of that council, prescribed by the provisions of section 9, gives rise to two important issues:

First, the council would include at least one representative of the nonpublic elementary and secondary schools of the State. While we are not opposed to church interests having a voice in determining how they are to expend Federal funds in their schools, advisory council representation would give such interests a role which goes much beyond that. Indeed, religious groups would be considering questions of policy for all of education, including public education.

Our second comment regarding the State advisory council is that school board representation is not specifically required thereon. Since it is the local school boards who bear the practical responsibility for educating our children, we would hope that this council, which has as its responsibility the giving of advice and making reports on general education policy, would draw on insights of a school board member in its own decisionmaking process.

APPEAL PROCEDURE

We note that local school boards do not have any right to appeal to the State and/or HEW to either challenge the merits of the State plan or the equities of any financial distribution thereunder. We feel that the denial of an appeal procedure to local boards goes too far.

ADMINISTRATION

Under H.R. 7796, the responsibility for administering the special revenue-sharing program rests with the Secretary of HEW, rather than the Commissioner of Education. Mr. Chairman, we are strongly opposed to this designation for several reasons.

First, in part, our rationale for embracing the special revenue-sharing concept is that it reduces administrative overburden. Experience shows that programs operated at the Secretary's level produce the antithetical result.

For example, the Headstart program is within the Office of the Secretary. Rather than managing it under title I, the Secretary's office treats it as a special unit within HEW. Consequently, school boards now have one more office to find and establish liaison with, another set of regulations and guidelines to become familiar with, another set of application and reporting procedures to comply with.

This provision promises to deepen the existing administrative nightmare.

This takes us up to my second point. For several years now, NSBA has been urging the Congress and the President to assign a higher Federal priority to education through the establishment of a Department of Education. We can only regard the shift of responsibility for administering these programs from the Commissioner to the Secretary as an effort to effect both a long-term downgrading of education's

priority as well as to erode the sense of identity which the education community has with the Commissioner's office.

DISCRETION

Section 11 of the bill provides that the Secretary may retain 10 percent of the appropriations for additional grants to the States. Based on last year's appropriations of $3.3 billion, the Secretary would then have a fund of $330 million.

Proponents of section 11 will argue that, since a 10-percent discretionary fund is normal for Federal education programs, this amount really does not exceed the current discretionary level. Furthermore, they will argue that the grouping of such funds into one pot should not be objectionable, even though greater discretion will result thereby.

The purpose of the special revenue-sharing plan is to ease the administrative burden of State and local governments in the management of Federal programs. We fail to see how the creation of a general slush fund will advance that purpose.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 3 of the bill provides that Congress shall provide "such sums as may be necessary for carrying out this act." We have generally been opposed to authorizing language which does not specify a dollar amount. And such is the case now.

We believe that a bill of this scope, nearly the whole Federal commitment to elementary and secondary education, should define both the financial needs of education and the Federal objective or target in response thereto. By excluding such figures, the bill, in effect, shifts to the Appropriations Committee a function which we prefer to have performed under the expertise of this committee.

Mr. Chairman, we fully applaud the President for recognizing administrative problems which confront school boards in the management of Federal programs.

But, as desirous as we are to seek the enactment of a special revenue-sharing plan, we will not embrace any proposal until all questions pertaining to the distribution formula are resolved.

However, even should the formula contained in H.R. 7796 prove to be acceptable, we are absolutely opposed to the enactment of this bill because of (1) its treatment of the impact aid including public housing programs, (2) its inclusion of non-public-school representation on the State advisory council and its failure to provide for local school board representation thereon, (3) its failure to provide local school boards with a procedure to challenge State plans and financial distributions made thereunder, and (4) its failure to state a financial goal in the authorization of appropriations.

Furthermore, while we recognize the need for a discretionary fund, we urge that controls thereon be written into the legislation.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity of making this presentation to you, and I will turn back to Gus Steinhilber.

Mr. STEINHILBER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have Dr. Oser discuss the operation of current programs, particularly as they relate to the Houston School District.

Mr. OSER. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, it is my pleasure to see Mr. Bell, before whom I testified a couple of years ago with regard to the Emergency School Assistance program.

My statement is written in colloquial form and I prefer to read it, if I may.

For many months—nay, years—you have heard in presentation after presentation the details of the financial crisis faced by public education in the United States.

This crisis, current and future, is well documented, and it seems as we look across the Nation today that many forces are being brought to bear on the solution of this crisis, from the State Supreme Court of California to the Fleishman committee reports of New York, to the Governor's Committee on Educational Reform in the State of Texas.

I am not here today to expand upon the information that you already have at hand or to dwell in more depth on those particulars. Instead, I would like to deal with a more pervasive problem, a problem whose fingers reach into all of the areas of school finance, school problems: the problem of control—local and otherwise.

In order that my comments not remain in the philosophical realm, I would like to particularize them by a discussion of the title I program—what has been expected, what it has done, and what I see as its future requirements.

First of all, title I has been expected, very simply, to perform miracles. It is somewhat akin to the hope that 10¢ for a cup of coffee given to a person with no other financial resources will turn that person into a corporation executive 3 hours hence.

Title I has had a hope of providing adequate financial support for youngsters who need that support, but it has attempted to do a tremendous task with miniscule funds.

Across the Nation and in Texas, we have something like $150 per year per student in title I funds. In Houston, Tex., this $150 brings our per-pupil expenditures for youngsters in the Houston Independent School District in the title I target schools approximately up to the national average of per-pupil expenditures throughout the Nation.

In New York City, the title I addition in funds does not even bring the total per-pupil expenditures up to the State average.

In addition to the small absolute amount of funds available for title I youngsters, the title I program must bear an additional burden of providing survival services—food, clothing, medical and dental care.

So on this pittance dedicated to youngsters of great need we have put the combined burdens of educational excellence and survival services, a burden which it is impossible for title I funds to bear as they are currently provided.

Let's look for a moment and see what title I has done. In Houston, Tex., just a few years ago, members of the board of education were publicly saying that there were no hungry children in Houston. I might say those board members are currently political casualties.

79-836—72——3

Today nearly 50,000 youngsters are fed hot lunches daily from the combined funds of title I and the Department of Agriculture. Medical and dental care is provided to youngsters numbering approximately 30,000 in 27 schools in Houston. We are currently exploring the possibility of providing clothing for the youngsters who have that need.

One can talk about educational need, but until the youngster is in school, clothed and fed, one may as well forget the educational need because the educational system is not going to reach that youngster. So we in Houston feel a basic commitment to provide these kinds of survival services. We provide them from title I funds because currently those are the only funds available to us for providing these services.

In addition, part of our title I funds is used for what are nominally called "cultural enrichment programs." These programs provide experiences for youngsters which they would not otherwise have because of their parents' inability to pay for transportation to areas of interest throughout the city—the museums, zoos, theaters. We feel this is an important part of our program, but again these are programs that drain resources from the hard, substantive educational programs.

These moneys should be available from other sources beyond the title I sources.

Our heaviest emphasis in Houston in title I funding is in the area of substantive—what I call hard—educational programs. Our administrative staff and the board of education are dedicated to the principle that our job, first and foremost, is providing excellence in education for every youngster in Houston. Consequently, all funds, be they local funds, State or Federal funds, are funneled into programs of substantial educational impact.

In Houston, for example, approximately $2 million of our title I funds, or about half the total title I allocation, is used in experimental reading programs. In nine elementary schools we have the exciting LEIR program; in nine schools, the productive BRL program; in nine schools, the Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich series, which attempts to bridge the cultural gaps that previous reading programs have not.

We think this is where the emphasis should be in the use of title I funds, but it is very difficult for us to provide the necessary survival services, the necessary cultural enrichment programs, and these substantive educational programs in a way that fits the need of the youngsters of our community at the current level of funding.

I strongly oppose any efforts on the part of Congress or the administration in diminishing the dollars available in the title programs. In fact, I would press strongly for great expansion of these programs so that these necessary services could be provided in a more meaningful way to youngsters across the Nation.

Educators today are agreed that educational funding, in order to have an impact, must reach what they have termed "a critical mass." It takes a certain amount of money before one can overcome the inertia of the situation, before one can make progress in bettering the educational environment.

I don't believe the title I funds in the amount they are currently distributed have much of a chance of overcoming this inertia, of making an impact, because they do not reach a critical mass.

To those critics who say title I has failed, I say "hogwash." Title I has barely been tried. Whatever alternative funding patterns are devised by Congress or the administration, I would urge that protection be given to the categorical programs currently in force and that more dollars be directed to supporting these programs.

Let me move now from a cursory discussion of title I into some comments concerning control. One of the most overworked terms by members of boards of education, Congressmen, members of the administration is "local control." For the most part, these words are merely a demagogic artifice for saying something else.

There are no Federal strings on education programs, such as the title programs, that we in Houston cannot live with. There are no strings that we find so burdensome that we would desire to have those strings removed. In fact, we urge the Congress to maintain the kinds of controls that guarantee accountability, that guarantee that Federal funds which are our tax dollars be spent in a constitutional fashion.

We demand that the national priorities be fulfilled in the guidelines for expenditure of these funds.

Local control should not mean the boards of education have the freedom to violate constitutional dictates. Last year, Senator Mondale documented innumerable cases of the results of weak controls in the Federal program of emergency school assistance. We do not want to see those sorts of things repeated.

It is strange that those who speak so strongly for local control often violate that very principle in the same breath. Recently, Vice President Agnew in the second of three televised interviews with the press spoke about the administration's opposition to the Child Development Act. Vice President Agnew, I would suppose, is one who could be put in the camp of strong supporters of local control.

Yet, when queried about the administration's opposition to day care centers, he said that he felt that mothers would take advantage of these centers if they were available. And he didn't feel it was proper that mothers would be able to take advantage of these centers and not fulfill their motherly duties.

That is the kind of stance that has beclouded the issue of control. On the one hand, the proponents say, "We want local control"; on the other hand, they formulate legislation which disallows any kind of local control.

Similarly, on the issue of Federal funding of transportation, the loudest proponents for local control are the first to say there shall be no Federal moneys available for the transportation of youngsters. Local districts, under court order, are currently providing that transportation out of local funds, and local districts would like to have the flexibility to search for Federal or local funds at their own discretion and not be boxed in by those so-called proponents of local control who, in fact, attempt to make decisions for the local boards at the national level.

Let me move to the areas of control that I think are less clouded, the practical areas of control, the areas that we face in the day-to-day operations of school districts in this Nation.

There has recently been in the case of Model Cities and in proposed legislation to do with general revenue sharing a movement toward the

funneling of Federal funds to local agencies other than school districts, funds which ultimately are used in the educational system.

There have been serious practical problems, mind you, not basic differences in philosophy between administrative units, but practical difficulties in dealing with funding. The problem is particularly acute where the local education agencies are independent, fiscal entities.

Of the 50 large school districts, 37 of those districts, like my own district in Houston, are fiscally independent school districts. By State statute and State constitutional mandate, these districts have been created as independent bodies and, as such, are responsible for the expenditures of funds.

Whenever we receive funds from a local agency, such as a municipality, and expend those funds for educational programs, we have to pass those funds through our normal accounting procedures.

For districts our size, the phase lag, the system lag, the time it takes for processing, board approval, administrative review, is approximately 30 days. When that time is coupled with the time for the municipality's approval processes, the total time is approximately doubled to 2 months. If there are any problems along the way, if for example the city council or the school board has some questions that require modification of the proposal, the process can take many months.

Let me cite a particular instance. A program proposed by the Houston Independent School District to be funded by Model Cities was the ongoing education of pregnant girls—a program of critical need in the Houston School District. We made the proposal in July of 1970, and did not receive from the city of Houston a letter to proceed until April 23, 1971, when there was only a 5-week period of the school year remaining for implementation of this program.

There was no particular problem with the city's approval of this program nor the school district's but needed modifications in the program, location sites, funding levels, et cetera, took three-quarters of a year to obtain final approval processing.

The control that is involved is of utmost necessity, but the very fact that it must pass through all these control agencies limits the speed with which we can implement programs.

The problem in this process is that comptrollers whose duty it is to approve payment of bills only if they meet their interpretation of the mandates of the law—local, State, and Federal—there are always variations in interpretation and hence considerable amounts of time are used in resolving these differences in interpretation.

If we want systems that efficiently deliver education to youngsters, then we must have a single controlling agency. Hence, I would urge this committee, when it is considering alternative funding procedures to those currently adopted, to seriously consider the practical problems and that these funds be given directly to school districts for their use in the design of educational programs that meet the local needs.

There is a facet of control, a sensitive area, one that is probably as politically landmined as the discussion of local control, and that is the role of decisionmaking with respect to program funding.

Unfortunately, many school districts throughout this Nation have excluded meaningful involvement of parents in decisions concerning

the educational programs of their youngsters. In order to correct this imbalance, Federal programs have encouraged considerable involvement of parents in that decisionmaking.

I stand strongly for parental involvement in the operation of the schools that provide services to the youngsters of those parents, but I believe that we must carefully assess the role that parents, professional administrators, and elected trustees must play in order that we bring about the result that we jointly desire.

Parents are not skilled in designing educational programs. They are skilled, and in fact are the only people skilled, in assessing the needs of their youngsters. Boards of trustees are elected officials representing the public in making educational and financial decisions, and are accountable to that public for those decisions. They are also constrained by the requirements of State and Federal constitutions, and State and Federal statutes as well as local ordinances.

Parents, professional educators, and school trustees must maintain these areas of expertise if we are to produce a product which meets the needs of the youngsters. We must carefully distinguish between educational programs which require expertise in program design and development. from welfare programs which are designed to meet the needs of unemployment.

In welfare programs, involvement at the decisionmaking level is an important component of the overall program goals, but in education we must make sure that the parental involvement is specific to defining the needs of the youngsters, allowing room for the professional administrators to design the program and delivery system to meet those needs.

If, in fact, the system is designed and implemented in this fashion, we bring to bear community support for change, for educational innovation which is much needed in our schools. This combined effort of parents, school administrators, and elected trustees will not only devise better plans, but will be able to in fact implement those plans because of the broad base of support established by joint decisionmaking.

Last, I would like to touch upon another kind of control. It is a control that comes from our knowledge of what is effective. Most of the real control that exists in educational decisionmaking is control based upon constraints—legal constraints, financial constraints, constraints of our knowledge about how youngsters learn and grow.

We need to make sure that, in our national program of educational funding, there is flexibility in that programing which allows for modifications to meet the needs as the constraints change.

Let me specifically talk about what has been talked about much in the last few years, cultural enrichment programs. As I mentioned earlier, we in Houston engage in cultural enrichment programs, but we believe that it is much more difficult to see benefit from these sorts of soft educational programs than it is from the harder, more specific educational programs such as the reading programs we are currently funding under title I.

I would like to recount for you an incident that happened in Houston about a year ago when for the first time a number of youngsters in a cultural enrichment program were transported across the city to a music theater to watch a performance of a local group and then to re-

spond to that performance. The youngsters had just returned from the theater, and their responses were being taped for further analysis by the teachers in order to make the program even more meaningful the next go-round.

One of the youngsters was asked what impressed him most about this program, and, mind you, he had just gotten back from seeing an entertaining theater production of a program content that would have been interesting to youngsters. His comment was that the most impressive thing that day was a five-story parking garage that he happened to notice as he was being transported along one of the freeways in Houston to the music theater.

This little anecdote exemplifies what educators are finding out about "cultural enrichment." They are finding that cultural enrichment is not necesarily a specific experience such as a museum trip, a theater trip, but it is relating, observing, dealing with all of the stimuli that stream into a youngster's consciousness.

It is very difficult to structure experiences so that they are, by their very nature, enriching experiences. Explicitly then, as educators' ideas change as to what is beneficial for youngsters' education, which, of course, in the broadest terms is his enrichment, we should make certain that there are no immovable Federal constraints upon shifting educational dollars from what were previously termed cultural enrichment programs to hard substantive educational programs. That is what I mean by local control.

In summation, I urge this committee to give serious consideration to the maintenance and expansion of the title programs which have served this Nation's children so well.

Second, I urge this committee, if it is to consider other funding means to offset the serious financial crisis that faces our schools, that it do so in a manner that provides for efficient delivery of educational services directly to the recipients, the youngsters, and that in those funding techniques there be no immovable constraints that would prevent local education agencies from using those funds to the maximum educational benefit of the youngsters involved.

In your deliberations, I plead that you give careful examination to the cries of "no strings" and the cries of "local control," to look behind those words for what they really mean, so that the legislation that results will truly meet the needs of youngsters throughout our great country whose futures depend so intimately upon your decisions. Thank you.

Mr. PUCINSKI (presiding). Thank you very much. I am very pleased to have you before the committee this morning. As always, your testimony is very constructive, and I know of very few people who have made as great a contribution toward meaningful legislation in the field of education as you have, and your organization.

Mr. Oser talked about looking for additional means of meeting the financial crises of our educational systems throughout the country.

You are aware of the fact that next week we hope to begin hearings on the National Partnership in Education Act which would hopefully make the Government a one-third partner in financing the cost of education in this country. I was very pleased to see Dr. Marland, the Commissioner of Education, last week in Atlantic City, speak out in support of a broader role on the part of the Federal Government.

I, myself, have proposed that we ought to have a national commitment in this country that we will spend no less than $1,200 per child for education to assure every youngster in this country an equal opportunity at quality education.

With the Federal Government helping, local communities and States could meet that kind of a national floor. Gus, do you have any top-of-the-head thinking on this whole approach?

Mr. STEINHILBER. We had planned to testify later before your subcommittee and to go into specifics about a general aid formula. We have over the last few months taken a look at such things as your partnership bill, Mr. Ford's bill, Mrs. Green's bill, and we are going to have a specific statement thereon.

We have also appeared before the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to talk about the problems of the property tax and possible value-added tax. I might add in this respect we are somewhat concerned about the current view of the value-added tax, because while it will in one way help the local property owner in terms of relieving some of his tax burden, at the same time it will not provide any new money for education.

The financial crisis will not be lessened. Any activity in terms of expanded preschool programs could not be funded, occupational career education, the added cost of those, this will not provide the new money for those, nor will it help some of the beleaguered cities in terms of their deficits.

So while discussion of these alternative funding methods is valuable, right now we find ourselves in the awkward position of saying "but this does not really help." It may help certain individuals but it certainly does not provide any money for education.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Well, that is true. You know my colleague from New York, Mr. Peyser, and I have sponsored a bill to include on that Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations members of school boards simply because we feel that we ought to have this input into this whole dialog.

I agree with you that the value-added tax would not do—at least as we understand at this point—what some people think it would do in terms of helping education. All it would do is replace existing taxes, and while we are very anxious to deal with the question of property taxes, I believe that the testimony which we will have before our committee next week from the legal experts, who will discuss the California decision, the Texas decision and the Minneapolis decision and various others, will show this committee conclusively that we must move in the direction of structuring a program of assistance, meaningful assistance to local communities which will include relieving these local communities of reliance on local taxes for the education of their children.

I agree with the California decision that this concept does provide unequal educational opportunities for children in this country. It has been because of that situation that we have had this rash of varying court decisions all over the country dealing with the transportation of youngsters and various other facets.

So this whole question will be discussed at great length when we go into hearings on some meaningful general aid program.

Mr. STEINHILBER. The National School Boards Association has been pursuing two goals, one at the Federal level which you are well familiar with, but at the same time we have been trying to get changes in State legislation to correct the property tax, and in fact we are a party in several of the cases which you mentioned.

Our concern at the State level was not so much the abolition of the property tax—we have not gone to the point of saying the property tax is unconstitutional—our concern is about the vagaries of district lines, and where industry or houses are placed should not bear upon the education of a child.

Therefore, it is the inequities within the State system which can be corrected and hopefully we will be able to obtain that correction.

We ought to then look to the Federal Government to provide the new money because the property tax probably has gone to its fullest extent as far as financing the new kinds of things we talked about and would like to go toward.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I have said many times, as long as we have this disparity and this wide divergence of expenditures for education, where one community spends $600 per child—the national average is $700 per child—and the richer communities can spend $1,200 and $1,400 per child, we really leave the courts very little recourse or alternative.

Many people are incensed with the decisions of the courts. But the fact of the matter is that when the court looks at the educational opportunities afforded a ghetto child and the educational opportunities afforded a child in a very prosperous suburban area, that court has no choice but to deal with methods and formulas that will close the disparity of educational opportunities.

This is why I am convinced that those who are disturbed about the courts moving into this area ought to take a look at school financing, and when they realize the basis for these decisions, perhaps they will then accept a proposal for a national floor of, let us say, no less than $1,200 per child, from whatever sources, Federal, State, and to some degree local.

I don't think that that kind of a base would in any way disturb the main thrust of the testimony this morning. Title I would play and would continue to play a very key and integral role in that concept.

I was very pleased to see our chairman arrange these hearings on this whole restructuring of programs to show the real value of title I. My only criticism of title I is that we have never given it a chance. We have always underfunded.

If we could have full funding of title I and provide the kind of funds that the authorizing committee, this authorizing committee, carefully put together in title I, and if these local communities could have those funds, my judgment is that there would be some extraordinary results from the title I programs across this country.

Mr. Peyser.

Mr. PEYSER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I, too, would like to welcome the gentlemen who are here this morning to testify. I do have a couple of questions that I would like to direct to Mr. Buhrmaster, if I may, dealing with the revenue-sharing bill that Mr. Mills now has in the Ways and Means Committee.

Of course, I have actively supported revenue sharing from its inception, its introduction by the President in 1971, but now that Mr.

Mills has it, one thing that is specifically excluded from Mr. Mills' bill is the question of any funds going or being used for education.

Now, I happen to be personally opposed to this stand that the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee has made. I have contacted every member of the Ways and Means Committee urging them to consider the inclusion of education in this revenue-sharing bill.

I wonder if you could give me your thoughts on this subject, as to whether you think this is a valid point, that it should be included.

Mr. BUHRMASTER. Congressman Peyser, I appreciate your asking that question. The National School Boards Association certainly will not support any general revenue program that eliminates aid to education. We certainly recognize, as you do, I am sure, and as Congressman Pucinski has stated, we should have a couple of school board people on ACIR so ACIR would get the input and recognize the problems of education.

We are spending some $43 billion in elementary and secondary education at the present time. As you know, $3.3 billion comes from the Federal Government. If there is going to be additional aid to run the Government, we think there should be additional aid to run the schools because this is where we are particularly concerned. This is a great problem.

This is not a local—State problem, it is a national problem, and we expect that support for any revenue sharing bill would not be forthcoming from National School Boards unless it provides a method of getting aid to education.

Mr. PEYSER. I hope, if you have not already done so, that you are making this point clear with Boards throughout the country and also are asking them to notify their Congressmen of this feeling because I think this is a very critical part of this revenue-sharing bill.

If this bill comes out of committee without an education feature, and if it comes under an open rule on the floor, I do intend to offer an amendment on the floor to include education as one of the areas for which the money can be used. But the real question is going to be whether we get an open rule.

So I think every effort should be made now while it is still in committee to let the impact of this be known to as broad a constituency as possible here in Congress. So I would urge that steps be taken by your own organization if it has not already done so.

Mr. BUHRMASTER. We have done so, but we will emphasize it. Certainly if it does come out in a supportive amendment such as you mentioned, we can change our viewpoint and strongly get backup.

Mr. PEYSER. I have a question for Mr. Oser.

Mr. Oser, you make reference in your testimony, under the title I provisions, to a substantial amount of money in effect being used for hot lunches for the children in Houston. Am I correct in that understanding? That is what I read here.

Mr. OSER. Not a substantial amount. It has diminished since the Agriculture Department picked up a large portion of that share, but it was the basis of the institution of that program in Houston several years ago.

Mr. PEYSER. My question is that I don't believe the concept of title I was to develop a hot lunch program. Now I recognize that failings have taken place at a governmental level, and this committee played a

vital role this past year under Chairman Perkins, in very rapidly moving to bring about a dramatic change in the hot lunch program. But I don't interpret title I as providing a basis for hot lunch money and I am trying to find out what this really means in Houston.

Mr. OSER. Our highest priority for title I funds is hard educational programs, but we also have a commitment to bring youngsters into school and make them receptive to the educational program, and we feel the hot lunch program is part of that. We have used title I funds as supplemental funds to the other funds available for the hot lunch program over the years.

This year we have been able to reduce that portion considerably because of the increase through the Agriculture Department. So it has been as a supplemental fund with other funds available.

There was a critical discussion in Houston several years ago about whether we even needed funds for such services. And to us in Houston this was a critical turning point in the recognition of the extreme needs of youngsters in our schools.

That is why I am emphasizing it here, not because it is a substantial part of our title I funds but because it was of considerable political import in Houston that we recognize and meet those needs.

Mr. PEYSER. Would you say the amount of money is a negligible amount of this program?

Mr. OSER. It is negligible, yes, sir. We receive about 31 cents for each youngster. We add on about 10 cents, I believe, to cover the rest of our local costs.

Mr. PEYSER. Another general question I have is directed to anyone of you gentlemen. One of the problems I found in looking at title I in different places in the country is the general unawareness of the public of the existence of title I and what it really means.

I am wondering, is there any program that is organized to let the public know what title I is and what it is trying to do? I think there is such a lack of knowledge in this area, and I think it falls directly back to the local school areas to develop a program of information.

Mr. OSER. May I speak to that? I have a supplemental piece of material which in fairly graphic form describes what we are doing with title I funds and model cities funds in Houston. I distributed copies to the committee. I would like to enter this into the record as an explication of the impact our title I funds have had on the educational environment of youngsters.

Mr. BUHRMASTER. I think this is pretty well understood by school board people, but I agree that it is not entirely disseminated properly to the public in general. I would say one of the reasons of course why it has not had as wide distribution is the fact that in the smaller and the poorer districts it has been quite impossible, as stated in my testimony, for a district to be able to comply with the requirements to get the title I money, and therefore nothing much has been said about it.

I think with simplification there will be greater use of such funds. I would certainly agree that more information should be made available to the public through school board publications and through the general press and other media.

Mr. PEYSER. I think this would be very worth while.

I recently addressed a group of around 400 or 500 title I administrators and one of the subjects I discussed at that time was the need for public information because I found on personal inquiry that the public in many areas which are receiving title I funds have absolutely no awareness that the money is there or what it is being used for.

I think this is a detriment to the program, and hopefully PTA's and organizations like that could be recruited to get this information out.

Thank you.

Mr. BUHRMASTER. Thank you.

Mr. PEYSER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS (presiding). Thank you.

Let me first ask the gentleman from Houston: It is most difficult to get a program funded after we authorize it. Title I is approximately 50-percent funded. I would like to see a general aid program enacted.

That is the first program I ever worked for when I came to Congress; I put in a general aid bill in early January 1949.

But at what level of funding should we leave title I and go to general aid? I would like to hear your comment on that. I listened to a lot of your suggestions this morning. Tell me what your views are.

Mr. OSER. As an advocate of title I, I would like to see as much money as possible put into title I before any movement is made to general revenue sharing. That is my personal opinion. I believe that we have a long way to go unless priorities nationally are changed considerably before we have money left over to put into other kinds of distribution systems.

Chairman PERKINS. Assuming that we could make a hard drive before the Appropriations Committee and get an extra $2 billion. I mean under the present law, would you suggest to the committee that this extra $2 billion all go for title I funding instead of in the direction of general aid?

Mr. OSER. I really do not know. It is so hard to develop a perspective from Texas that you develop here as you see all the various problems.

Chairman PERKINS. What would be your suggestion?

Mr. OSER. My suggestion for our particular purpose would be that a considerable portion go into title I.

Chairman PERKINS. You know your needs in your area; you have a long way to go before those needs are met?

Mr. OSER. Yes, sir. Let me give an example. Most districts give our youngsters examinations for reading proficiency. We have a wide range of distribution of youngsters' reading proficiency. We have some youngsters at the 15th percentile of the national average. We have others in the 97th percentile. We have a long way to go to provide the services for those youngsters in the 15th percentile that would bring them up near the national norm.

These are expensive kinds of programs. So we could use considerable funds in dealing with this very specific educational problem just in Texas.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead.

Mr. BUHRMASTER. You asked, if $1 billion additional funds were provided, where should it go? I think it should go into title I, but the $1 billion is not any semblance of enough money to do the kind of job that has to be done.

Chairman PERKINS. I agree. Don't misunderstand me. I agree wholeheartedly with you. I think we should be spending presently $15 billion for elementary and secondary education. I believe that the need is there. It has been well established in the hearings of this committee.

Mr. BUHRMASTER. All I can say is "Amen."

Chairman PERKINS. We have to utilize the dollars that are made available to the best advantage of the schoolchildren in the country, and that is why we are seeking the avenue or the road to travel, which way we should go.

Mr. BUHRMASTER. We should like to see the full funding of everything you put through in title I. We would like to see additional billions of dollars, and we would also like to get a program that supports education to the tune of 30 or 40 percent nationally.

Chairman PERKINS. What we want to know—I am for revenue sharing and all that, but I represent a lot of poor areas, and I want to make sure that we are going to get more money back than we are going to lose, and that it is on top of some of these good programs and that we do not let our good programs go down the drain in the meantime.

Mr. BUHRMASTER. I feel strongly this way. Our national organization feels strongly this way. We certainly don't want to throw away the property tax until such time as we find something that does a much better job. I think that there is still a lot of merit in the property tax. The distribution of that tax is pretty faulty in some places. I am not so sure but that we cannot correct that to a degree.

But by all means, if we are to do the job in public education today that every one of us in this room wants, we have to finance it in a little different way than we have in the past.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me say to you gentlemen that we are going to explore all approaches through our hearings and probe deeply and try to improve education in every way possible. All the hearings that we have held thus far point up the fact that we are not making the contribution that we should be making to our elementary and secondary schools.

How we are going to get the Congress to appropirate more money is one of the problems that we have to live with and work with and do our best with.

Mr. Quie.

Mr. QUIE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Buhrmaster, did I hear you say that you like the way title I operates and you would like to see more money come in title I? Is that what you are making a plea for, title I?

Mr. BUHRMASTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. QUIE. I think I heard you say that the Federal Government ought to fund 35 or 40, or was it 30 or 40, percent?

Mr. BUHRMASTER. I think perhaps the first time we met, Congressman Quie, I made a statement of 40 percent. This is a statement that has been made by National School Boards. I met with Congressman Perkins, too, and this same statement has been made. We do believe sincerely if we had 40-percent support of public elementary and secondary education from the Federal Government, it would be in line with putting on a program.

Mr. QUIE. Since title I appeals to you and you want to go to 40 percent, do you think the aid ought to come through title I so we go to

40 percent, or do you think it should go through other categories, or how do you think that 40-percent Federal aid ought to come?

Mr. BUHRMASTER. We like special revenue sharing, but we also like general revenue sharing if general revenue sharing will provide funds, as Congressman Peyser has just said, to educate. Any general revenue sharing that has been proposed that eliminates aid to education has no support from my organization.

Mr. QUIE. So you would prefer, then, general revenue sharing and special revenue sharing to bring about the total of 40 percent?

Mr. BUHRMASTER. Right.

Mr. QUIE. Does that mean, then, that you would not favor general aid on a per capita basis to school districts as was proposed in some years past?

Mr. BUHRMASTER. We certainly would consider any type of aid along that line. I mentioned that we would like to see how that is determined, if it is to be weighted. You speak of per capita aid—"per capita" meaning actually per capita, or per capita weighted one way or another.

If it were to be weighted one way or another because of low income, handicapped, or likewise, we would like to know the method of weighting and the reason for it.

I would say this, I am from New York State although I am talking for the National School Boards Association—we have a large percentage of underprivileged people in the New York City schools. That is a New York City problem. It is a New York State problem. That is a national problem.

We need some way of providing the additional funds for those children in a city just as we do in the hinterlands of Vermont or Montana or you-name-it.

Mr. QUIE. I gather you would favor some kind of weighting or equalization factor then?

Mr. BUHRMASTER. I am sure we must recognize the fact that the costs are different and the needs are different in different parts of the country.

Mr. QUIE. You have an equalization formula in State aid in New York?

Mr. BUHRMASTER. We certainly do. Since there are at least a couple of us from New York State, we think it is better than some of the other States, but it still has its deficiencies to provide support for legislation. There is no question about it that we have had to bring up what we call a flat grant oftentimes for the wealthier districts in order to get passage of a bill that would take care of general aid throughout the State.

We have created our own inequalities but there has been a practical reason for creating that inequality.

Mr. QUIE. So you think that the Federal Government's aid ought to equalize between States at least? Wouldn't you say, then, of course, the poorest would get more benefit than a wealthier State?

Mr. BUHRMASTER. Surely.

Mr. QUIE. How about the equalization within the State? Should the Federal Government provide for the equalization within the State, or should we do the equalizing between States and let the State do the equalizing within the State?

Mr. BUHRMASTER. I think the States are able to do the job within their own States and this they should do.

Mr. QUIE. You just indicated you ran into some difficulty with some of the wealthier districts, that in order to get the bill through you had to give them additional support.

Mr. BUHRMASTER. Congressman Quie, I think we all are changing our minds about many things. Some of the conversations that have come up have brought the problem to the forefront, and I would suspect that there will be considerable change in all States.

We have a committee report that has just come out that is recommending—only three chapters have been presented to the public, but it is basically presenting the viewpoint that the State of New York should handle full funding of education.

I am not sure that is going to be acceptable, but I am sure that it is going to bring to light, to our legislators and to our public, the viewpoint that we have not equalized as well as we should and that a better job needs to be done, and done immediately.

Mr. QUIE. I would like to indicate that I agree with you. I hope you stick by your guns and push for the State's doing its own equalizing You have not done a perfect job and I would say no State has done a perfect job. Some are more imperfect than others, but I think if the Federal Government tries to do it for you the job will be even more imperfect.

Mr. BUHRMASTER. We certainly ought to be able to get it done quicker within our own States.

Mr. QUIE. The situation appears in title I where a school district in effect equalizes the use of title I money; it concentrates the money in the schools where the need is the greatest. You cannot do that in the State, concentrate the money where the need is the greatest. There are some poor kids in wealthy counties and they receive the title I money. And there are poor kids in poor counties in the State of New York and every other State and they can do equalizing within the school district but they cannot equalize across the State.

Do you think you should be given the authority to do more equalizing or have more authority in the distribution of title I money?

Mr. BUHRMASTER. Why don't I turn to you, George? You have had greater experience in this than most of the members.

Mr. OSER. I have not really faced that problem. I think the State can certainly do an additional kind of equalizing. They could offset the problems we currently face there. I don't really have an answer to that question.

Mr. STEINHILBER. One of the hopes we have is that the problem that you presented to us will be a disappearing problem, because if we are successful in the litigation and the changes in State legislation take place, the differences that you have just given to us will, by and large, be reduced or perhaps be even eliminated.

I am not trying to evade the question except in the terms that we may find ourselves in even greater administrative difficulty if we try to use Federal programs to correct the inequities already within States before the States which are now really unnoticed have been given that kind of an opportunity.

I would like to see them be given the opportunity first to put their own house in order.

Mr. QUIE. If they are unable to do that, they would probably be unable to do anything with title I if we give them additional authority.

Mr. OSER. Let me add an additional comment. There are other kinds of things that have impact on a youngster's education besides the total dollars spent. I think the youngsters you speak of, the poor youngsters who are in some fashion isolated in a rich district, benefit in other ways, as pointed out by the Coleman report, where they have an additional educational benefit. So I believe title I reaches those youngsters effectively now.

Mr. QUIE. They do within school districts that are large but they don't between counties. As I observe, there are some counties that have wealth but they have a pocket of poor kids.

Let me ask you about your 40-percent Federal funding. What percent do you think the State ought to fund?

Mr. BUHRMASTER. We have said 40-percent Federal, 40-percent State, and 20-percent local.

Mr. QUIE. How do you think that 20 percent ought to be raised?

Mr. BUHRMASTER. I am not so sure but that the determination of that should not be in the hands of the local district and I would assume that at least for the foreseeable future it would be perhaps done on the basis of either an add-on income tax or a continuation of the property tax.

Mr. QUIE. If you have an add-on income tax, can the local people really have any voice then in the revenue that is raised for their schools?

Mr. BUHRMASTER. Well, if it comes back to the district from which it came, and there is some determination as to the amount that this might be, yes, they would have. I am not worried about the control factor, Congressman Quie; I am not as worried as many are. I have rather a belief that many who are worried about Federal control have forgotten that we have had Federal support in many areas over long periods of time, and I could relate in the area of higher education where we have had Federal support in land grant colleges, that even some of the trustees did not quite realize they did have Federal support. There had never been any evidence of Federal control.

It does not bother me.

Mr. QUIE. I think you have Federal control now, and people are living with it pretty well. If you get Federal aid you are going to get Federal control. If you can consolidate programs there will be less control than with so many categorical programs.

What I am concerned about is that a local school district can have as good an education as it wants. I like your concept of the 20 percent, but I am wondering if the add-on income tax is going to permit them to have as much control over that tax's authority as they do with the property tax.

Mr. BUHRMASTER. I am not ready to throw the property tax out.

Mr. QUIE. Neither am I, so long as it enables people to have better education than they would otherwise receive depending on the Federal and State. I think the State ought to bring people up to a minimum level of education.

Chairman PERKINS. I concur in the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota. There are inequities throughout the country in connection with the property tax, in my judgment. We have it in eastern

Kentucky where we have some areas better off financially than the really dilapidated mining communities that do not have any resources. But at the same time we have no substitute for the property tax, and those inequities by and large can be eliminated to the extent that no individual would be unreasonably denied home ownership.

I know they are excessive in certain areas. They are in my district. In other areas they are not. But the inequities I think can be eliminated in connection with the property tax to a degree, and the idea of throwing the property tax out, we know it is just not going to happen.

If we throw it out on schools, the property will be taxed for other governmental purposes all the way across the board, but until we get something, until we get support, we have to maintain the property tax.

Mr. BUHRMASTER. I am sure we all agree we know how to do a better job in handling that property tax, and we had better get about doing it.

Mr. QUIE. Let me ask you one final question on equalization between the States. You would expect New York to receive less per capita on an equalization between the States than some of the other States, like Mississippi, would you not?

Mr. BUHRMASTER. It is generally true, in that fashion. I would assume that as long as Mississippi had a greater need per pupil than New York had a need per pupil, that that should be the case. If by chance, though, it were determined that an unusually greater need existed in a wealthier State, it should be so recognized.

Mr. QUIE. Could you define what you mean by "need" because your per capita income is so much greater in New York than in Mississippi?

Mr. BUHRMASTER. I would assume that might continue that way, but if it were to change—we have an influx in New York State of people from out of State that in some instances have had no formal education and if we take a 6-year-old and a 16-year-old with no formal education and put them into a public school program, it is a costly program. The need is very great.

The State is very wealthy, but per capita need is again pretty great because these numbers are great. What do we have? We have in the New York City schools. I believe I am correct in saying that we have something like 290,000 Puerto Ricans and 340,000 blacks, and that the two together are still a minority.

And in some instances these people have come to the district, have come to the State, have come to the city without the education advantage that they would have had in many other parts of the country. The cost of providing education to these children is great, and the method of support, I really don't care just how it is determined as long as it is adequate.

I would expect that New York State in general, though, would provide more support to the Federal Government than it would receive. I believe we have something like 11 percent of the population, and in general New York State paid 14 percent of the tax bill.

Mr. OSER. You have to consider, too, the amount of urbanization in the State. The municipal overburden of a highly urbanized State is another concern that was pointed out. The court in New Jersey held the method of State funding unconstitutional. We have seen this in Texas and we have seen States shifting from predominantly rural to predominantly urban.

Our laws were developed back in 1947 when the States were primarily rural and those laws have not changed enough to meet the urban needs we see in the cities. So that should be a consideration also, not just the expenditure per pupil in education but the entire overburden in a municipal area.

Mr. QUIE. One of the problems if you have inferior rural education is they move into the city and they become your adult problem to add to the municipal overburden. We could reduce our social expenses dramatically in the long run in this country if an adequate education were given to children in the elementary grades. You cannot stop a child from learning beyond that, if he has an adequate education in the first six grades.

What I really want to get your views on is this. In title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, New York gets the bonanza. It is the first time the equalization worked the other way around. I want to make certain when we pass new legislation we will help the poor areas of the country where they exist.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you, gentlemen. You have been most helpful and I want to again compliment you and your representatives here in Washington. Gus has been most outstanding. When we call on the school boards for their viewpoints, he is always available and gives the committee the utmost cooperation.

Thank you all.

Mr. BUHRMASTER. Thank you very much.

Chairman PERKINS. Just a moment.

Mr. LANDGREBE. I would like to say I commend you on your statement that each State should paddle its own canoe. I never felt the Federal Government should deal directly with local school boards. As I have stated before, I wonder how Congress would feel if suddenly some international agency appeared that was dividing money among countries and they said, "In the United States we will divide among the States because the Federal Government cannot be depended on to divide it properly." We would be embarrassed.

One question with regard to your 40–40–20 formula. Since there are a variety of ways States handle funding of public education, how do you formally relate to that? For example, in some States the State bears the brunt of education and in other States the local community bears the brunt.

Mr. BUHRMASTER. I guess I don't understand your question. I agree with your statement.

Mr. LANDGREBE. You were talking about a division of funding of 40–40–20; 20 percent from the local government, 40 percent from the State and 40 percent from the Federal Government. There is an assumption that all States handle their educational funding equally.

In some States it is done primarily by the State; in other States it is done primarily by local communities. In those areas where the local community is primarily responsible for education, this is where the property tax is extremely high.

Mr. BUHRMASTER. I would not say that is of necessity a general statement because we do have areas where the funding is at a level in excess of the 40 percent that I mentioned, and still property taxes

79-836—72——4

are unreasonably high. The cost of education, the quality of education in some of those areas is at a very high level.

The variations are too great to make any general statement as to what is done. Some of your good educational programs in some of your larger States are supported by anywhere from 30 to 60 percent. Yet we do have States, starting with Hawaii, on down to New Mexico and so on down, where the funding is very heavy at the State level. There is no general statement.

Mr. OSER. I would say, to add to that, that in arriving at the Federal share which is the primary concern of that formula, one can use the average of the State support. This is not to say that States would be constrained to have a 40–20 split within that State for the local—State share. But in just arriving at the Federal share, one would take the overall National-State average of support, which is about 41 percent. .

Mr. LANDGREBE. I feel it would be a sliding scale rather than 40–40–20.

Mr. OSER. I think part of that would be determined by the appropriation formula as it has been in the past.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Our next witnesses are the representatives of the impacted area school districts: Charles Hand, Ayer, Mass.; G. C. Burkhead, Elizabethtown, Ky.; Francis Laufenberg, Long Beach, Calif.; and George Membrino, of Chicopee, Mass.

We will start with you, Mr. Hand. Identify yourself for the record, and go ahead.

STATEMENTS OF REPRESENTATIVES OF IMPACTED AREA SCHOOL DISTRICTS: CHARLES HAND, AYER, MASS.; G. C. BURKHEAD, ELIZABETHTOWN, KY.; FRANCIS LAUFENBERG, LONG BEACH, CALIF.; AND GEORGE MEMBRINO, CHICOPEE, MASS.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I wish to thank the members of the committee for the opportunity of appearing before you to present information.

Chairman PERKINS. Without objection, your prepared statements will be inserted in the record.

(The statements referred to follow:)

STATEMENT OF DR. CHARLES HAND, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, AYER AND SHIRLEY, MASS.

Honorable Chairman and Members of the Committee: I wish to thank the members of the Committee for the opportunity of appearing before you to present information in behalf of the extension of Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 as well as for full funding of these programs.

I wear three hats today: first, as Superintendent of Schools in Ayer and Shirley, Massachusetts, highly impacted areas; secondly, as New England representative of the National Impacted Area Schools Superintendent's Association; and thirdly, representing our National Chairman, Superintendent Briscoe of Alameda, California, to bring testimony for the Northeast area.

Our concern for the continuation of the impact programs is reflected by the presence of our Ayer School Committee Vice-Chairman Frank Harmon and our Shirley School Committee Chairman David Legere.

First I would like to discuss my local situation. Large portions of the original land of the towns of Ayer and Shirley, Massachusetts, have been taken over by

the Federal Government for military purposes and no longer is taxable. Of the 8.82 square miles of the Town of Ayer, approximately 2 square miles, or one-fourth of our land area, has been taken for Fort Devons, the largest military installation in New England. In Shirley, the Government has taken 589.6 acres or approximately 1 square mile.

The loss of this land not only means a loss in taxable property, but also means for each of these towns that it can no longer be used for the normal expansion and growth of industry and housing to make a broader tax base.

In Ayer, the total school enrollment is 3700. Of this number, 2080 as of last Friday live on Federal property and are in the *A* category of Public Law 874. There is only one school on the military base, a million dollar addition to which has just been funded after a *four* year delay under Section 10 of Public Law 815. It will be a year before it is completed. The boys and girls of Fort Devons are appreciative of this Federal effort. The 300 million dollar plus approved projects still pending under Public Law 815 concern them, as their stay at Fort Devons is limited. They may move to an area needing new school facilities. My Doctoral research pointed out that students at Fort Devons stay on an average of 2 years, and have attended, or will attend school in five or more school districts during their school career.

The one school at the base now houses 300 pupils. The other 1780 pupils living on the military base are transported to other schools within our school system. An additional 400 pupils are in the B category. They are B students because about half are the dependents of military personnel stationed at the base or overseas who live within the community and half are the children of civilian personnel who live in the community and are employed at the military post. Of the remaining 1620 students in the Ayer Schools, 250 are tuition students from another town and only 1370 can be classified as pure Ayer students. Sixty seven percent of Ayer's entire school population is Federally connected.

The valuation of the Town of Ayer is 8 million. The school budget is close to 3 million. The population of the town is less than 5000. The assessed valuation per pupil is a little over $2000. This says, in layman's terms, that the amount of money behind each student is very limited.

The picture in Shirley is much the same. The Town's valuation is 4 million and over 20 per cent of its pupils are Federally connected B pupils. In Shirley, 7% of the school budget reflects Public Law 874 aid.

Our school districts are only two of 449 applicants in New England, broken down as follows:

	Number of applicants	Approximate A and B entitlement
Connecticut	47	6,000,000
Maine	22	5,000,000
Massachusetts	215	20,000,000
New Hampshire	60	3,060,000
Rhode Island	24	5,500,000
Vermont	21	200,000

To complete my Northeast assignment, I should mention the states of New York and New Jersey—New York approximately 23 million and New Jersey approximately 18 million.

None of the above figures reflect public housing entitlements under the C Section of Public Law 874.

I have been associated with Public Laws 874 and 815 for 15 years as a teacher, principal, assistant superintendent, and superintendent. I have liked the way they operate. I have liked the freedom given local school committees to use the funds for the educational benefit of students with a minimum of red tape. However, recently I have been concerned about the possible curtailment of field services by our Regional HEW offices. I feel that their proposals will make the administration of Public Law 874 extremely and unnecessarily cumbersome at the local level.

I am here to speak for the extension and full funding of Public Laws 874 and 815.

I am not unaware of the court cases concerning the property tax which are being discussed throughout our land. I am not unaware of the rethinking of public school financing which is just around the corner. I am pleased that Congressman William Ford's General Aid Bill uses the Public Law 874 "concept" as a model.

It will be a few years before there are vast changes in financing. In the meantime, the schools of Ayer, Shirley, New England, New York, New Jersey, and other school systems throughout our country who are impacted must deal with curriculum innovations, remedial instruction (especially necessary with transient youngsters), expanding costs, and the administration and control of schools that are common to other American school systems.

I know that the members of the Committee are giving their best thinking to possible changes in educational financing.

However, until a future Congress is able to make changes, I urge full funding for Public Law 874 and Public Law 815.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF FRANCIS LAUFENBERG, ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENT, BUSINESS AND FINANCE, LONG BEACH, CALIF.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, my name is Francis Laufenberg and I am Associate Superintendent for Business and Finance of the Long Beach Unified School District. I am appearing today as the representative of the California League of Federally Aided School Districts. Thirty-seven districts are members of the League.

My purpose in testifying today is to urge your continued support of all existing Federal programs for education. I especially urge your full support of PL 874 and PL 815 until a comprehensive bill for general support of education, such as Congressman Ford's HR 12696, can become effective.

In pleading for the continued support of PL 874 and PL 815, I would like to briefly list a number of hard cold facts which, I hope, may conteract the cliches, catch-phrases and generalities used for over twenty years by administrative critics of PL 874 and PL 815.

1. School Districts are and will continue to be largely dependent on the property tax.

During 1971–72 the State of California will provide an average of only $284 per pupil in grades K–14. The average cost of education in California is over $800 per pupil. The bulk of the money comes from the property tax. The Long Beach Unified School District budget for 1971–72 totals $77 million. Only 19% of that $77 million comes from the State. Local property taxes provide 73%.

2. Homes, as property, never have and never will provide the taxes necessary to educate the children of a community.

3. The major portion of school district taxes comes from the businesses and industries that create a community.

4. Federal Government activity is a large industry in many communities. Such activities bring in workers and children and at the same time they remove land from the tax rolls and produce no taxes on the improvements built on that exempt land.

5. Money spent by Federal employees in a community *may* help the local businessman, and even the City via the sales tax, but there is no direct flow of money to help the local school disrict meet its obligations.

6. When any portion of our industrial society is exempted from taxes, the burden of filling the void is automatically distributed among the remaining taxpayers.

7. The fact that the Federal Government has removed taxable property from the assessment rolls, and created a group of workers whose children must be educated by the remaining taxpayers, has been partially offset by means of Public Laws 874 and 815.

8. Public Law 874 currently authorizes the payment of $450.32 for every child whose parents *both live and work* on tax exempt Federal property. The actual cost per pupil in local property taxes in the Long Beach District is $675.25.

9. Public Law 874 currently authorizes the payment of $225.16 for children whose parents work on Federal property *but live in tax producing local housing.* The average home in Long Beach is valued at $20,000, and is assessed at $5000. Such a home produces approximately $200 per year in school property taxes.

Even in a home with only one child, the above contribution leaves a tax shortage per pupil of approximately $250.

10. Public Law 815 authorizes funds for construction of schools needed because of the impact of Federally connected children. Again the law assumes some of the burden of bond interest and redemption normally paid for by local property taxes.

11. Both Public Laws 874 and 815 have been efficiently administered. The funds pass directly from the U.S. Treasurer to the local district without interference from Federal, State, or County bureaucracies.

12. The Stanford Research Institute in 1965 and the Battelle Memorial Institute in 1969 both recommended the existing programs as "defensible" and "sound."

SERRANO-PRIEST DECISION

Many people are now discussing the "Serrano-Priest" decision in California relating to equity in school financing. The intent of the Supreme Court of California, in ordering this case to be heard in Superior Court, was to require that court to arrive at a decision which would mandate a more equitable distribution of school funds, including the existing income from the property tax. The recommendations of the State Supreme Court *do not* abolish the property tax or require it be increased *or* decreased as a total statewide source of income. The mandate is simply that a system be devised by the Legislature which will distribute the income from the property tax more equitably.

There is no evidence that the final decision on Serrano-Priest will be made this year or next. There will probably be long court delays and appeals. The principle of Serrano-Priest will provide no additional money for schools and will possibly injure the urban districts, which have usually spent *above* the State average. The National Urban Coalition, and other liberal groups who supported the Serrano-Priest lawsuit, are now having second thoughts. Many fear they have actually caused harm to the very urban districts that Serrano-Priest was designed to help. The urban districts, which actually depended largely on the property tax, will see their property taxes distributed statewide and their financial problem *increased* rather than reduced.

In summary, there appears to be no hope of additional State or Federal funding in the next year or two that could replace the loss of existing PL 874 and PL 815 funds. We therefore urge the renewal of these authorizations for another two year period. Your continued full support of other urgently needed Federal programs for education is also requested.

Mr. HAND. I wear three hats today: First, as superintendent of schools in Ayer and Shirley, Mass., highly impacted areas; second, as the New England representative of the National Impacted Area School Superintendent's Association; and third, representing our national chairman, Superintendent Arthur Briscoe, of Alameda, Calif., to bring testimony for the Northeast area.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, with your permission I would like to introduce two school committee members who are with me today.

Chairman PERKINS. Without objection.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Frank Harmon, vice chairman of our Ayer School Committee, and Mr. David Legere, chairman of Shirley School Committee. They have a real interest in the things you are doing.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me put one question to all of you gentlemen. Do you have some other educational program that can take the place of the so-called impact aid program or do you want to hold fast to the impact aid program?

What is your answer to that?

Mr. HAND. We want to hold fast to the impact aid program until we have a massive Federal aid program.

Chairman PERKINS. What about you, Mr. Burkhead?

Mr. BURKHEAD. I would hold fast to the impact aid program.

Chairman PERKINS. What about you?

Mr. LAUFENBURG. Yes, that is the essence of my statement.

Mr. MEMBRINO. Certainly.

Mr. HAND. First, I would like to discuss my local situation. Large portions of the original land of the towns of Ayer and Shirley, Mass., have been taken over by the Federal Government for military purposes and no longer are taxable. Of the 8.82 square miles of the town of Ayer, approximately 2 square miles, or one-fourth of our land area, has been taken for Fort Devens, the largest military installation in New England. In Shirley, the Government has taken 589.6 acres, or approximately 1 square mile.

The loss of this land not only means a loss in taxable property, but also means for each of these towns that it can no longer be used for the normal expansion and growth of industry and housing to make a broader tax base.

In Ayer, the total school enrollment is 3,700. Of this, 67 percent of Ayer's entire school population is federally connected. The valuation of the town of Ayer is $8 million. The school budget is close to $3 million. The population of the town is less than 5,000. The assessed valuation per pupil is a little over $2,000. This says, in layman's terms, that the amount of money behind each student is very limited.

The picture in the town of Shirley is much the same. The town's valuation is $4 million, and over 20 percent of its pupils are federally connected B pupils. In Shirley, 7 percent of the school budget reflects Public Law 874 aid.

I have been associated with Public Laws 874 and 815 for 15 years as a teacher, principal, assistant superintendent, and superintendent. I have liked the way they operate. I have liked the freedom given local school committees to use the funds for the educational benefit of students with a minimum of redtape.

However, recently I have been concerned about the possible curtailment of field services by our regional HEW offices. I feel that their proposals will make the administration of Public Law 874 extremely and unnecessarily cumbersome at the local level.

I am here to speak for the extension and full funding of Public Laws 874 and 815.

I am not unaware of the court cases concerning the property tax which are being discussed throughout our land. I am not unaware of the rethinking of public school financing which is just around the corner. I am pleased that Congressman William Ford's general aid bill uses the Public Law 874 "concept" as a model.

It will be a few years before there are vast changes in financing. In the meantime, the schools of Ayer, Shirley, New England, New York, New Jersey, and other school systems throughout our country, which are impacted, must deal with curriculum innovations, remedial instruction—especially necessary with transient youngsters—expanding costs, and the administration and control of schools that are common to other American school systems.

I know that the members of the committee are giving their best thinking to possible changes in educational financing. However, until a future Congress is able to make changes, I urge full funding for Public Laws 874 and 815. Thank you.

Mr. QUIE. Dr. Hand, could I ask a question? You say in your testimony you have been concerned about possible curtailment of field serv-

ices by regional HEW offices. I don't know what field services you are talking about.

Mr. HAND. I am in the Boston area, where the HEW people come out to audit our records and give us guidance in terms of the financial aspect of the program, check the forms, and so forth. Now there is a program underway whereby we are going to have to take two counts, get two forms, send 5,000 forms to Boston where some secretary is supposed to check the forms, and school registers and all this type of thing are going to have to be brought to Boston.

I have 13 areas where some reorganization may take place. Now, in the past a regional representative would come to the town of Ayer and take my 2,500 forms. He would check the forms. He would check my financial records, check my school registers, and help me in terms of the proper administration of Public Law 874; throw some forms out that I included that I should not have included; in other words, saving the Government some money.

Now the new thought is a secretary in Boston can do this type of thing, and I personally feel that administratively it is going to hurt our program at the local level.

I have the 13 suggestions, if I could submit this for the record.

Chairman PERKINS. Without objection, it will be inserted in the record.

Mr. Peyser, any questions?

Mr. PEYSER. No, sir.

Chairman PERKINS. You go ahead, Mr. Burkhead.

STATEMENT OF G. C. BURKHEAD, SUPERINTENDENT EMERITUS OF THE HARDIN COUNTY SCHOOLS, ELIZABETHTOWN, KY.

Mr. BURKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I have appeared before this committee many times in the last 20 years. I was notified a few hours ago to be here this morning. I don't have a prepared statement, but I would like to have permission to enter a prepared statement.

Chairman PERKINS. Without objection, you will be permitted.

Mr. BURKHEAD. Thank you.

(The statement referred to follows:)

SUPPLEMENT TO THE ORAL TESTIMONY OF G. C. BURKHEAD

Mr. Chairman and members of the Education and Labor Committee, I am G. C. Burkhead, superintendent emeritus of the Hardin County Schools, Elizabethtown, Ky.

On February 23, 1972, I have oral testimony before this committee and asked permission to submit supplementary testimony in writing for the record. This request was granted, and for this I am deeply grateful to the committee.

This testimony not only reflects the interest of my own school district, but also it is in the interest of the other sixty districts in Kentucky who receive funds from Public Laws 815 and 874. I believe that it also presents the sentiments of a large majority of the impact districts across the Nation.

I agree wholeheartedly with the statement made by Congressman Broyhill of Virginia before this committee on February 23, 1972. He said in substance, "When the U.S. Government takes away a portion of the tax base from a school district, it places itself in the position of a taxpayer and should pay such district for the consequent loss of revenue."

In Hardin County where Fort Knox Army Post is located, 110,000 acres of land have been removed from the tax base. This is about one-fourth of the total land area of the county. The tax revenue from this vast amount of land is lost

forever to local governmental agencies. The acre value of this land would be comparable to that of the other land in Hardin County.

It is true that the Fort Knox Army Post has attracted great numbers of people to this area, and it has provided great numbers of jobs. It has, however, utterly failed in compensating the local governmental agencies for the loss in tax base. It is this tax base that provides funds for the operation of schools and other governmental functions.

If, however, we disregard the loss in taxable property, the government still has a firm obligation to provide aid to the schools just as industry would do if investments were made in factories that brought to the area an equal number of people. The Government must place itself in the position of taxpayer in order to compensate for its vast installation of nontaxable properties.

Since World War II, the school enrollments in Hardin County have tripled. About one-third, 3,250 pupils, are federally connected. Approximately one-half of this number are children whose parents are in the uniformed services. Counting 2½ children per family, it would take 1,350 homes to house them. If they all lived in homes valued at $100,000 each, the tax revenues received would pay less than one-third of the actual cost of educating these children. These families, of course, do not live in expensive homes; many of them live in trailers and pay little or no tax. According to the latest count by the Hardin County Health Department, there are more than 6,000 trailers in the county. In this connection, I would also like to point out that automobiles of service personnel are not taxed, and that much of their shopping is done for food and other necessities at the post exchange where no sales tax is paid.

For more than thirty years, the Hardin County School District has levied the maximum tax rate provided by State law, and it has been forced to keep its bonded indebtedness at the maximum. Without the aid of Public Laws 815 and 874, it would be impossible for the school district to provide for more than a six month school term and provide even a minimum program of education during those six months.

These same facts can be duplicated in hundreds of school districts throughout the Nation. There is simply no other way except through Public Laws 874 and 815 for many, many districts to even keep their school programs in operation.

I would like to pay tribute to those superintendents who, during the late forties fought so valiantly and courageously for Impact Legislation. The school leaders deserving the most accolades are Ralph E. Hood of Brunswick, Georgia, the late Oscar V. Rose of Midwest City, Oklahoma, and Bill Simmons of Detroit, Michigan. There were, of course, others. I would like also to pay respect to the many fine, foresighted Congressmen who realized that this legislation has enabled school districts all over the Nation, more than four thousand of them, to keep the school doors open and who because of their understanding and support have made it possible for millions of children to have at least the minimum essentials of a good education.

The need was great in 1950 when P.L. 815 and 874 Laws were first enacted by the Congress. The need still exists today, and in many cases the needs have increased and continue to increase year by year. The title of the first Bill passed read, "A Bill to Provide for the Education of Children Residing on Certain Non-supporting Federally Owned Property and Children Residing in Localities Overburdened with School Enrollments Resulting from Federal Activities in the Area, and for Other Purposes."

Gentlemen, the need has not changed. We still have the Federal Activities—increased activities in some areas—there are still the rising school enrollments in these areas, and there is still the large concentrations of population. We still have more than four thousand school districts affected by Federal Installations, four thousand school districts who year by year find it more difficult to balance the school budget because of dwindling Impact Funds. Many districts have been forced to cut services because Congressional Appropriations have not met Congressional Authorizations.

I would like to remind this Committee and the Congress that any sudden cut-off of Public Law 874 Funds would result in disaster for millions of children throughout the Nation. For several years, the funding for this legislation has been gradually reduced. Even greater reductions are being recommended for the next Fiscal year. The Touring Committees of 1949 found unbelievable conditions in the schools then, and I protest that further reduction of funds would result, in many instances, of conditions even worse than those found in 1949.

The recommendation in the President's budget for the next fiscal year is far from adequate. If these recommendations are accepted by the Congress, the original intent of the Law will be defeated. School districts with large concentrations of 3(b) children will receive the hardest blows. In Kentucky, not more than three, perhaps a few more, will be able to qualify for any aid at all. There are at present 33,000 3(b) category children in the State and only 116 3(b) category children. The budget proposals for the next fiscal year will fund 3(a) category children at 100% School districts with 3(b) children must absorb 5% of the total budget before receiving any funds.

In Hardin County, Kentucky, with a budget of six million dollars, the district must carry $300,000.00 of the impact burden before receiving any funds. This in effect would bankrupt the system and destroy what is termed a good program of education as measured by school standards in the Southern States. Many school systems in the South and elsewhere in the Nation with large enrollments of 3 (b) category children would find themselves in even direr financial conditions than those outlined for Hardin County. Reductions in funds will affect the 1600 children of men in the Uniformed Services residing in Hardin County; the 1600 children of Federal employees living in Hardin County will be affected; the children of citizens not directly connected with Fort Knox will be penalized. Yet, the children of men in Uniformed Services who live on Fort Knox will be funded at 100% and thus the Fort Knox Schools will continue to offer an effective and adequate program of education. Here is another example—two adjacent districts are heavily impacted—one with 3 (b) children and the other with 3 (a) children. The 3 (a) district would be fully funded under the budget proposal while the 3 (b) district could find itself bankrupt.

I would suggest, and I recommend, that the original intent of the law be carried out, that is, if Congress fails to fully fund Public Law 874 that each category of children bear its proportional part of the deficit. This would mean the burden is borne by all and as a result no school district would be destroyed.

The present Administration is holding out bright promises in new programs for education where there will no longer exist a need for Public Law 874 funds. The Impact Superintendents over the Nation do not resist change when it is proved that such change will meet the needs that exist. It is my sincere opinion that school leaders of the Impact districts over the Nation would be almost unanimous in recommending that the existing titles in categorical aid and Public Laws 815 and 874 be fully funded until such time as General Federal Aid can be financed at a level where the present programs would be no longer needed.

Public Laws 874 and 815 have been great and good pieces of legislation. The Laws have met the needs for which the legislation was orginally intended. The purpose, the need—both are still there—and I want to recommend and insist that this legislation be continued for at least three years, or until such time that certain recent Court decisions have been adopted and new machinery put into effect for changes in the future financing of education throughout the Nation.

Briefly, I have tried to emphasize in this presentation the following points:

1. The need, the intent, and the purpose of P.L. 874 and 815 still exist after twenty years of operation. 2. The Fiscal Year 1973 Budget recommendations are inadequate and unfair. 3. The proposed methods of proration of funds for different categories of children would bring disaster to many school districts while others would prosper. 4. That all categorical aid under the Title programs be continued and fully funded along with P.L. 874 and 815 until such time as General Federal Aid is adopted and there is no further need for such programs.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you and the Committee for having allowed me the privilege of appearing once again—and for one reason only—the educational welfare of this Nation's boys and girls. You have been very fair and courteous.

Respectfully submitted as prepared by G. C. Burkhead, Superintendent Emeritus, Hardin County Schools, Elizabethtown, Kentucky, and part-time consultant for Impact Aid Districts in Kentucky.

Mr. BURKHEAD. I am a retired superintendent of the Hardin County Schools. After serving 35 years as superintendent of schools, if Public Law 874 and 815 ever had a friend it is I, because for 25 years we kept our schoolhouse doors open with the old Lanham Act funds received under Public Law 874.

Kentucky and the other Southern States have had a struggle to maintain a minimum education since the War Between the States.

With the advent of World War II, Federal investments and activities brought insurmountable problems in financing even minimal educational programs.

In the late 1940's I was among the first five or six superintendents who came to Washington seeking aid for impacted districts. The visits of this early group of superintendents attracted enough attention in the Halls of Congress that three subcommittees were formed who toured the country, I suppose, to find out if we had been telling the truth.

The honorable chairman came to my district and other districts in that area, and I think what he found was even worse than he had been told.

As a result of these reports of these committees, Public Laws 815 and 874 were enacted in 1950. During the 22-years history of these laws, millions of children have been benefited by a better instruction program and better school buildings. This legislation has been the difference between a very poor educational opportunity for children and a good educational program for millions of children across the country.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Burkhead, it would not hurt for you to review briefly just what constituted that impact in 1949. In your community, if I recall, you were in an old WPA program. The military installation around Fort Knox had just expanded and in your school system you were not able to take care of the children, and you had them in an old WPA building that was dilapidated, that dogs could jump through the cracks.

Mr. BURKHEAD. That is right, Congressman.

Chairman PERKINS. Then I went back there a few years later after you got your Impact money and saw the new brick buildings that you had. It really impressed me, what a great job had been done with the Impact funds.

Mr. BURKHEAD. We had 75 children crowded in rooms not large enough to accommodate 20. We still have pictures of you and the other Congressmen.

In my opinion, the need, purpose, intent, and the philosophy of the law have changed little during the 22 years of operation. It is still as logical and fair and reasonable as it was when the title of the first bill was written in 1950.

I would like to warn the committee that any sudden drop in the funds for Public Law 874 would be disastrous to hundreds of school districts; the condition might even be worse than you found back in 1949 in your visits throughout the country.

Kentucky is a poor State, as are a lot of the other Southern States, and we are making a reasonable effort to finance a quality educational program. We have a 5-percent sales tax and also an income tax. Still, we are struggling. Regardless of the effort to bring about better educational programs in the Southern States, the problem seems to be everywhere in finding enough money to operate.

For example, a real crisis exists in the city of Louisville, one of a quarter-million-dollar deficit financing this year. I made a survey of the 60-odd Impact districts in Kentucky, and it revealed some facts that were alarming to me. For example, two districts would have to cut teacher salaries $1,000 per teacher if the Impact funds were taken

away. Others said their library and supplementary materials would have to be curtailed. Special programs in music and art would have to be cut out.

In my own school district, where there are 9,500 children, 3,250 are federally connected, about one-half of this 3,250 are soldiers' children. An odd condition exists. On one side of the road the children attend schools on the post. On the other side of the road they attend county schools.

I would like to commend the Congressmen for financing under section 6 the post schools. But the soldier on one side of the road—his children deserve as good an education as the ones on the other side.

I would urge the committee to give serious consideration to the extension and full funding of Public Laws 874 and 815 for at least another 3 or 4 years. This is necessary, regardless of the proposed changes in future financing of public education in order that the impact districts not be penalized where new methods of funding education are put into effect.

I appreciate the fairness and courtesies always shown by the committee, and again I want to thank the committee for this opportunity.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Burkhead, you have been most helpful to the committee in the past.

Let me say to all you gentlemen the committee will recess for 40 minutes. I have some business to transact on the House floor.

We will reconvene at 12:40 today.

(Whereupon, at 12 noon the committee recessed, to reconvene at 12:40 p.m., the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

Chairman PERKINS. We will begin. Go ahead with the next witness.

STATEMENT OF FRANCIS LAUFENBERG, REPRESENTATIVE OF IMPACTED AREAS SCHOOL DISTRICT, LONG BEACH, CALIF.

Mr. LAUFENBERG. My name is Francis Laufenberg, and I am associate superintendent for business and finance of the Long Beach Unified School District. I am appearing today as a representative of the California League of Federally Aided School Districts. Thirty-seven districts are members of the league.

My purpose in testifying today is to urge your continued support of all existing Federal programs for education. I especially urge your full support of Public Law 874 and Public Law 815, at least until a comprehensive bill for general support of education, such as Congressman Ford's bill, can become effective.

With your leave, I would like to skip some of the basic facts.

Chairman PERKINS. Fine. But let me ask you a question so we do not leave any ambiguities here that can be misinterpreted in the future. You say you want to keep all existing programs until we can get a comprehensive general aid bill enacted. Now, define the programs that you want to keep.

Mr. LAUFENBERG. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I think our great concern is that in the confusion caused by some of these court decisions on school financing the people will start to drop programs right now

without knowing exactly where they are going, and there would be a big gap in school financing.

I think we all realize that there are probably going to be some basic changes because of the court decisions, but what we are really trying to say is let's not throw out what we have got until we know where we are going and we are on our way to at least a substitute program and a better program. That is what I am really trying to say. Some of the programs have more merit than others.

Chairman PERKINS. What programs could we enact to replace vocational education? I am talking about the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Mr. LAUFENBERG. I would say in running through them quickly in my mind, Long Beach being a big naval supply center, Public Law 874 has been a big thing there for many years. In addition to that, I think our E.S.E.A. title I program has been successful, and we are matching, we are putting $1 million of our own money in to keep it going because of the lack of full funding rather than cut it back.

Our Headstart program we think has been very successful, and the vocational education program is constantly expanding and it has very full support of our board and community. In fact, they would like to do more in that area.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me ask you, would you recommend or suggest that any general aid picture that we go to be on top of and not in lieu of these programs that you have just mentioned?

Mr. LAUFENBERG. Yes, sir. I would hate to see these programs merely be used to fund ongoing normal, regular programs.

Mr. PERKINS. Do you agree with the statement of the first gentleman who testified?

Mr. BURKHEAD. I certainly do.

Mr. PERKINS. What about you?

Dr. MEMBRINO. I strongly agree, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PERKINS. Go ahead. I thought we ought to clarify that.

Mr. LAUFENBERG. I thought we would go through a few things on how Public Law 874 has served our district. First of all, I would like to say that school districts are now and will continue to be largely dependent on the property tax, I am sure, way into the future.

During 1971–72, the State of California will provide only $284 per pupil on an average across the State of California. The average cost of education in California is actually over $800 per pupil. The bulk of the money in California obviously comes from the property tax.

The Long Beach Unified School District which I represent has a budget for 1971–72 totaling $77 million. Only 19 percent of the $77 million comes from that State. The local property tax provides 73 percent. The rest comes from the Federal Government, miscellaneous sources.

I would like to go on to say that in our particular instance Public Law 874 currently authorizes a payment of $450 for every child whose parents work and live on tax-exempt Federal property. The actual cost per pupil in our district in local property taxes is $675. Public Law 874 currently authorizes the payment of $225 for children whose parents work on Federal property but live in tax-producing local housing.

Now, the average home in Long Beach, costing $20,000, assisted only one-fourth of that, or $5,000, which produces $200 a year in school taxes in our district. So even in a home with only one child that contribution would still leave a tax shortage when added to the Federal impact aid of $250. So even though it is a great program and we are very happy with it, it still does not meet the need.

I would like to mention something about the recent court decision, *Serrano* v. *Priest* in California, which is being repeated in other States. Many people are discussing the Serrano decision in California regarding equity in school financing. The intent of the Supreme Court of California in ordering this case to be heard in superior court—by the way, the supreme court did not hear it, they ordered the superior court to hear the case—in ordering the case to be heard in superior court they required that court to arrive at a decision which would mandate a more equitable distribution of school funds, including the existing income from the property tax.

The recommendations of the State supreme court do not abolish the property tax or require that it be increased or decreased as a total statewide source of income. The mandate is simply that a system be devised by the legislature which will distribute the income from the property tax more equitably. There is no evidence that the final decision on *Serrano* v. *Priest* shall be made this year or even next year. There will probably be long court delays and appeals. The principle of *Serrano* v. *Priest* will provide no additional money for schools and will possibly injure the urban districts which have usually spent above the State average.

The National Urban Coalition and other liberal groups who supported the *Serrano* v. *Priest* lawsuit in California are now having second thoughts. Many say they have actually caused harm to the very urban districts that *Serrano* v. *Priest* was designed to help.

The urban districts which actually depend largely on the property tax will see their property taxes distributed statewide and their financial problem increased rather than reduced.

In summary, there appears to be no hope of additional State or Federal funding in the next year or two that could replace the loss of existing Public Law 874 and 815 funds. We, therefore, urge the renewal of these authorizations for another 2-year period.

Your continued full support of other urgently needed Federal programs for education is also requested. I would also like to ask that this legal study by the schools attorney in San Diego on the *Serrano* v. *Priest* decision in California as it affects Public Law 874 be put into the record.

Chairman PERKINS. Without objection, the study will be inserted in the record.

(The document referred to follows:)

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT'S DECISION IN "SERRANO V. PRIEST" FOR PUBLIC LAW 874 "IMPACT AID" SCHOOL DISTRICTS

(A talk by Thomas A. Shannon, Schools Attorney, San Diego City Schools and Community Colleges, Dec. 24, 1971.)

On August 30, 1971, the California Supreme Court published America's most significant Court decision in recent decades affecting a state's program of

financing the operation of the public schools. In that case, *Serrano* v. *Priest*, several Los Angeles County public school children and their parents instituted a class action against various state and local county officials whose duties touch upon the apportioning, disbursing, accounting, and auditing of state financial aid which helps support the public schools.

The plaintiffs alleged three causes of action, which were:

1. That, as a result of the public school financing law in California (which relies heavily on local property taxes and thereby causes large disparities among individual school district in the amount of revenue available per pupil to support the educational program), there are substantial disparities in the quality and extent of educational opportunities among the various school districts in the State generally, and, in particular, the educational opportunities open to the plaintiffs are "substantially inferior" than exist in other districts in the State. All of this, plaintiffs contend, is repugnant to (a) the equal protection clause of the United States Constitution and (b) the California Constitution, including the provision requiring "a system of common schools" in the State;

2. That, as a result of the public school financing plan in California, the plaintiffs are required to pay a higher local real property tax rate than taxpayers in many other school districts to obtain the same or lesser educational opportunities; and

3. That there is a "real controversy" between the plaintiffs and defendant state and local school officials as to the "validity and constitutionality of the (public school) financing scheme under the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and under the California Constitution."

The plaintiffs requested that the Court declare the public school financing law in California unconstiutional, order the reallocation of public school funds and retain jurisdiction so that, if the State Legislature failed to restructure the public school financing law in light of the plaintiff's demands, the Court could do the job itself.

The defendants *demurred* to the plaintiffs three alleged causes of action in the Los Angeles Superior Court. The lower Court held that, in the form which the plaintiffs' complaint was presented to the Court, it did *not* state a cause of action and, therefore, no trial was warranted. The plaintiffs appealed.

At the outset of its opinion, the California Supreme Court defined the general overriding issue of the case as

> . . . whether the California public school financing system, with its substantial dependence on local property taxes and resultant wide disparities in school revenue, violates the equal protection clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment.

In examining the California public school financing law, the Court observed that over 90% of public school funds are derived from (1) local real property taxes and (2) aid from the State School Fund. Of these two, the Court said, the local property tax is "by far the major source of school revenue." And this locally produced revenue is primarily

> . . . a function of the value of the realty within a particular school district, coupled with the willingness of the district's residents to tax themselves for education.

As to the *State School Fund* portion of public school revenue, the Court found that attempts to establish a parity in funds available to local districts through grants of "equalization aid" and "supplemental aid" in addition to "basic state aid" merely "tempered" the disparities which resulted from vast variations in local real property assessed valuation throughout California, and

> . . . wide differentials remain in the revenue available to individual districts and, consequently, in the level of educational expenditures.

Therefore, the Court concluded that

> . . . the state grants are inadequate to offset the inequalities inherent in a financing system based on widely varying local tax bases.

In fact, the Court declared that "basic state aid," which is distributed to all school districts on a uniform per pupil basis regardless of a district's wealth.

> . . . actually widens the gap between rich and poor districts.

In view of this background of the public school financing plan in California, the Court analyzed the plaintiffs' alleged causes of action. The Court disposed first of plaintiffs' claim that the California Constitution's requirement that the Legislature provide "a" system of common schools mean "one" such system and,

therefore, mandates uniform educational expenditures for all local school districts. The Court gave short shrift to this theory of the plaintiffs when it held:

> . . . we have never interpreted the constiutional provision (to provide for "a" system of common schools) to require equal school spending; we have ruled only that the educational system must be uniform in terms of the prescribed course of study and educational progression from grade to grade.

The Court then addressed itself to what it called the "chief contention" undergirding plaintiffs' Complaint, namely:

> that the California public school financing scheme violates the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

The Court said that the United State Supreme Court measures the validity of State Legislation which concerns either (1) "suspect classifications" or (2) "fundamental interests" according to a strict constitutional standard. That is, any State law which purports to establish "classifications" affecting people, such as the public school financing laws where it appears that not all people are *equally* benefitted, is subject to a strict measurement against the United States' Constitution's "equal protection clause." Similarly, any State law which involves a "fundamental interest" also is subject to such measurement. In this constitutional measuring process, the State has the burden to prove:

1. That the State has a "*compelling interest*" which justifies the law; and,
2. That the particular manner in which the law treats people differently is *necessary* to further the law's valid purposes.

The Court first considered the California public school financing law on the basis that it is a "suspect classification." The Court affirmed as "irrefutable" the plaintiffs' contention that the school financing law is a "classification" based on wealth. While the Court conceded that the law, through its grants of "basic" and "equalization" aid, "partially alleviates" the considerable differences in the wealth of local districts throughout the State, the Court nevertheless specifically recognized that

> . . . the system as a whole generates school revenue in proportion to the wealth of the individual district.

The Court continued by declaring that—

> . . . discrimination on the basis of district wealth is . . . invalid. The commercial and industrial property which augments a district's tax base is distributed unevenly throughout the state. To allot more educational dollars to the children of one district than to those of another merely because of the fortuitous presence of such property is to make the quality of a child's education dependent upon the location of private commercial and industrial establishments. Surely, this is to rely on the most irrelevant of factors as the basis for educational financing.

The Court found *no* substance to the plea of the defendants that, if there were any discrimination in public school financing, it was "unintentional." Finally, the Court said:

> in sum, we are of the view that the school financing system discrimination on the basis of the wealth of a district and its residents.

The Court then turned to the issue of whether or not local public education is a "fundamental interest." It described education as playing an "indispensable role" in the modern industrialized State. The Court identified the "two significant aspects" of education as:

> . . . first, education is a major determinant of an individual's chances for economic and social success in our competitive society; (and)
> second, education is a unique influence on a child's development as a citizen and his participation in political and community life.

In more than six pages of eloquent testimonial to the crucial importance of education in our society today, the Court made manifest its view that public education indeed is a "fundamental interest." Having concluded that the California public school financing law is subject to being measured against the equal protection clause of the United States Constitution because (1) education is a "fundamental interest" and (2) the law providing for the financing of the public schools in California is based largely on local district wealth and thereby discriminates against the people of less wealthy districts, the Court addressed itself to the issue of whether or not such law was "necessary" to accomplish a compelling State interest.

The defendants State and local governmental officials argued that the public school financing law was necessary to strengthen and encourage local responsibility for control of public education. In rejecting this argument, the Court said

> . . . so long as the assessed valuation within a district's boundaries is a major determinant of how much it can spend for its schools, only a district with a large tax base will be truly able to decide how much it really cares about education. The poor district cannot freely choose to tax itself into an excellence which its tax rolls cannot provide. Far from being necessary to promote local fiscal choice, the present financing system actually deprives the less wealthy districts of that option.

The court also "unhesitatingly" rejected the argument of the defendants that

> . . . if the equal protection clause commands that the relative wealth of school districts may not determine the quality of public education, it must be deemed to direct the same command to all governmental entities in respect to all tax-supported public services . . .

The Court said

> . . . We cannot share defendant's unreasoned apprehensions of such dire consequences from our holding today. Although we intimate no views on other governmental services, we are satisfied that . . . (education's) . . . uniqueness among public activities clearly demonstrates that *education* must respond to the command of the equal protection clause (emphasis supplied by the Court).

In view of this, the Court held:

> . . . The California public school financing system . . . touches upon a fundamental interest . . . (and) conditions the full entitlement to such interest on wealth, classifies its recipients on the basis of their collective affluence and makes the quality of a child's education depend upon the resources of his school district and ultimately upon the pocketbook of his parent . . . (and, therefore) it denies to the plaintiffs and others similarly situated the equal protection of the laws.

Less than two months later, on October 21, 1971, the Court issued a "modification of opinion" (*Serrano* v. *Priest*, 5C3d 584) in which it declared:

> We emphasize, that our decision is not a final judgment on the merits. We deem it appropriate to point out for the benefit of the trial court on remand . . . that if, after further proceedings, that court should enter final judgment determining that the existing system of public school financing is unconstitutional and invalidating said system in whole or in part, it may properly provide for the enforcement of the judgment in such a way as to permit an orderly transition from an unconstitutional to a constitutional system of school financing . . . a determination that an existing plan of governmental operation denies equal protection does not necessarily require invalidation of past acts undertaken pursuant to that plan or an immediate implementation of a constitutionally valid substitute. Obviously, any judgment invalidating the existing system of public school financing should make clear that the existing system is to remain operable until an appropriate new system, which is not violative of equal protection of the laws, can be put into effect.

As a *practical* matter, *Serrano* NEITHER outlawed use of the real property tax to support local public education NOR invalidated special types of augmentations of school funds, such as additional funds for the physically handicapped, mentally retarded, gifted, or culturally deprived child. It does NOT mandate uniform spending on a statewide basis to operate local public school district or force each school district to have the same quality of educational program. Moreover, it did NOT invalidate added funds to deal with the unique problems of the urban school district. And it did NOT quash the concept of that special aid payable by the United States Government under PL 874 to school district serving the federally-designated "impact areas."

Having discussed what *Serrano* says, and what it does *not* say, let us turn our attention to a consideration of the possible impact of *Serrano* on future federal funding of local public education under PL 874.

Congress provides federal funds for the operation of local public education programs under PL 874 because it recognizes its responsibility for the financial impact which certain types of federal activities have on the local school district where such activities are located. In enacting PL 874, Congress showed that it clearly understood that federal activities can place a considerable burden on local public school districts because (1) federal property is exempt from being

taxed by local public school districts, or (2) local public school districts provide education for children *residing* on federal property or for children whose parents are *employed* on federal property, or (3) a sudden and substantial increase in school attendance can result from federal activities of various kinds.

The federal funds appropriated to carry out the Federal public policy declared by the Congress under PL 874 always have been considered—

> . . . exclusively for *supplementation* of the local sources of revenues for school purposes. (*Shepheard* v. *Godwin*, 280 F. Supp. 869 (p. 874) (1968). See also *Carlsbad Union School District* v. *Rafferty*, U.S. Court of Appeals for Ninth Circuit, No. 24, 955, filed July 28, 1970.

The decision of the California Supreme Court in *Serrano* did not specifically deal with PL 784 aid or the local school district needs which prompted its enactment. Of course, because the *Serrano* case was decided by a State Court, it has no direct impact upon, or control over, legislative actions of the Congress. If *Serrano* is affirmed by the United States Supreme Court on the U.S. Constitutional "equal protection" basis, then its principles will truly be the law of the land and PL 874 will be subject to intensive scrutiny by the federal courts on the issue of whether or not the classification of school districts into non-impact areas and "impact areas," which is an integral part of PL 874, is a "suspect classification" under *Serrano*. I believe that PL 874 would stand up against any constitutional "equal protection" measurement and be adjudged valid at law. But, I do not view this kind of *direct* attack against PL 874 as a real source of concern. Instead, I see an *indirect* influence exerted by *Serrano* on PL 874 about which PL 874 school districts must be especially vigilant.

I am convinced that today we are on the threshold of a complete "rethink" of financing local public education in America. We have, on the one hand, the principles laid down by *Serrano*, which, in the language of the California Supreme Court, augur for—

> . . . further(ing) the cherished idea of American education that in a democratic society free public schools shall make available to all children equally the abundant gifts of learning.

And, on the other hand, we have the growing recognition that dramatic increases in the input of so-called federal aid into the support of education, including private and public schools and, especially large, urban school district, should be forthcoming.

These two forces (*Serrano* and more federal support of education, generally) could combine to make PL 874, *in its present form*, obsolete and unnecessary. For example, let us speculate for a few moments. Suppose that the State public school financing laws are entirely restructured pursuant to *Serrano*, and an "equalization" factor were built into the laws in such a way as to offset with State aid the burdens now carried by federal funds under PL 874, according to the school finance theoreticians who insist upon viewing PL 874 funds strictly as "in-lieu" taxes. To satisfy even the most ardent partisan of PL 874 aid, let us also say that an "additive" were included in the State financing laws to provide for any additional costs over and above such "tax loss" which are attributable to educating federally-connected school children in "impact areas," just as State law may properly establish and fund other types of programs of special education. Or, in a second hypothetical, let us assume that a general *federal* aid-to-public-education law were enacted by the Congress which completely and accurately reflected, and paid for, additional costs of educating federally-connected children in "impact area" school districts.

In both of these hypotheticals, all of us would recognize that PL 874 would have no further useful life in the law; and we would not mourn its demise. But, we are practical men and fully realize that, in the infighting over substantial amounts of money in the State Legislative houses and in the Congress, many justifiable theories simply do not end up in the laws because of the dynamics of our vibrant democratic processes. And "Aye, there's the rub . . ."

In the total "rethink" of public school financing which is just around the corner, we must stand vigilant, not to the kinds of direct attacks on the PL 874 as in the past, but, rather, to the far more subtle and sophisticated attacks which could, in the name of *Serrano* and general-federal-aid-to-education, torpedo the "PL 874 concept." And I use the term "PL 874 concept" advisedly. It is of no consequence that PL 874 should cease to exist, provided that the "PL 874 concept" lives on in some other form of legislation.

79-836 O—72——5

We will have to continue our advocacy for the "PL 874 concept." If State legislation seeks to merge the "PL 874 concept" we will have to ensure that the finance formulas treat the "impact area" school district fairly and that sufficient flexibility will be built into the law to permit quick payouts in the event of quick buildups of federally-connected personnel in "impact area" school districts. In order to take into account the Court rulings in the line of cases dealing with PL 874 which began with *Shepheard* v. *Godwin* in Virginia in 1968, Serrano-type school financing legislation will need highly sophisticated draftsmanship or the States will lose millions in PL 874 funds. If Federal legislation in the form of a general aid-to-education law absorbs PL 874, we must be alert to prevent the "PL 874 concept" from dying on the vine.

Those are the legal implications of *Serrano* v. *Priest*, with special reference to PL 874. We are entering a time of profound reappraisal of our public school financing laws. The work done by us in the ensuing months will have a deep impact upon generations of school children yet unborn in America. Public education always has had its critics who have told us that the roads we have travelled were wrong. Today, though, we are at the crossroads. Public education now needs Advocates, as it never has before, not to carp about the wrong roads as the critics delight in doing, but to point out the new roads—and to lead public education up those roads so that it may continue to be the primary well-spring of our American heritage and the principal transmitter of our American values down through the generations. If Serrano becomes the law of the land in our Nation, and I believe it will, the task of remaking the financing plan for local education will be upon our shoulders. This will be an unparalleled opportunity to serve the People of our Community, State and Nation. With a good understanding of the Serrano principles and a clear focus on the political realities which surround the funding of local education, I believe we can serve them well.

Mr. LAUFENBERG. Thank you, that concludes my remarks.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you. Dr. Membrino.

Dr. MEMBRINO. My name is Dr. George Membrino. I am superintendent of schools for the city of Chicopee, Mass. I first of all would like to thank the chairman and the committee for having us appear on behalf of the authorizing legislation to continue Public Law 874 and Public Law 815.

I think we, as a group, would be remiss, Mr. Chairman, if we did not make it clear that we certainly know we are among friends, that this authorizing committee, going back decades, has furnished the basis for what support the Federal Government gives to education today.

We just wish, as a group and individually, and we speak for nearly 4,000 impact superintendents across this land, that we had such friends in the appropriations area because I know that you, Mr. Chairman, are well aware that the authorizing legislation you have provided has been tampered with and that now we find ourselves with the eventual cessation of this particular act in June of 1973, and the need again to continue what has proved to be——

Chairman PERKINS. You are suggesting to the committee that by all means we need to extend the impact legislation at least for another 2 years?

Dr. MEMBRINO. At least. We certainly hope that the authorization as recommended by this committee is carried out in the appropriations area.

Chairman PERKINS. Is the Federal level of funding for Public Laws 815 and 874 adequate at present?

Dr. MEMBRINO. It is not adequate. In fact, the 1972 level is not adequate. Neither was the 1971 level. I think our point here is that we certainly subscribe to the legislation as mandated in H.R. 514 in 1969.

Chairman PERKINS. In what area are you getting more?

Dr. MEMBRINO. There are gross inequities between A's. There is no reason why some A's should be fully funded and others at 90 percent. Certainly the large number of B's across this land are now being funded at 73 percent the current fiscal year and the elimination of certain B's in the coming year——

Chairman PERKINS. Will you write me a letter for the record, setting forth some specific illustrations of those inequities?

Dr. MEMBRINO. I certainly will.

Chairman PERKINS. I would appreciate your doing that.

Dr. MEMBRINO. I will do that, Mr. Chairman. We feel that category C, that was part of legislation that this committee worked out and had numerous hearings on, should be funded.

I think those three generally are the areas. The recommendation in the 1973 budget is grossly inadequate to handle that which has already been authorized so what we are appealing to is, first of all, to compliment the committee on a job well done and we certainly hope that it will see fit to continue Public Law 874 and possibly make it sufficiently strong and equitable so that others will understand as this committee has understood in the past.

For example, the city that I represent is a city with about 13,000 students of which 2,300 are category A students and an additional 800 are category B. students. The reason for the impact in our community is the location of Westover Air Force Base.

This military installation has removed from the tax rolls 5 square miles of an existing city of originally 27 square miles. And I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, just how. In respect to support of particular category B students in Massachusetts, as I am certain in other States, those in the military who live off base do not pay sales tax because of their being afforded PX privileges.

Most do not register their automobiles in the State where the installation is located because they continue their registration in their home State, thereby exempting them from such things as excise taxes and sales taxes and registration and other necessary taxes for the State.

They further do not work at a place that helps the local and State tax base. Primarily, they are on Government property and they don't pay taxes on their employment as would be the case, let's say, in some large manufacturing concerns in our city such as Spalding Sporting Goods or Uniroyal Tire Manufacturers.

The B category student I think has been criticized and we are all aware of it. There is no one with us today representing the Greater Montgomery area, Montgomery County, on which so much attack has come in the past and we think unjustifiably. I think, as an Impact superintendent coming from outside the greater metropolitan district area, we know, as was illustrated by one of the previous witnesses, that if the Government had to educate that one student, it could not do it as economically as it can under impact aid Public Law 874.

It has been proven time and time again that when section 6 has had to be invoked for the education of military or other students located on Federal property that Government has not been able to do it as inexpensively as has the local district. It has spent more money than what it would have spent if Public Law 874 were fully funded and continued.

I would like to make one final point, and again I think it is important, for this committee and for the record, to say that my State unfortunately has not followed the mandates of an amendment that was passed by Congress in 1968 having to do with how Public Law 874 funds are treated in a local district.

We heard testimony this morning to the effect that the original intent of the impact aid law was to guarantee funds to the local educational authorities in lieu of local taxes, and if this still is the intent of Congress, and if this is the intent of that 1968 amendment, then there is one State still in noncompliance and that is Massachusetts.

Last year, I know that the chairman is aware, and other members of the committee, that funds were stopped, Public Law 874 funds, for Massachusetts for a period of 4 months and then released. I would just like, for informational purposes, to let the committee know that that is now before the Federal court, the District Court of Boston, and we hope that before long the hearings will be held.

But it seems most unfortunate that of 50 States, one still resists the basic intent of Congress and, Mr. Chairman, I would like to be corrected if it is otherwise. This is still the intent without change.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you.

Dr. MEMBRINO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me compliment this distinguished panel. I can assure you that I am going to do my best to uphold the viewpoint as so ably expressed by all these gentlemen today on behalf of education in this country, and I think the majority of the members of this committee on both sides of the aisle feel as I do.

But for this program, I just don't know what would have happened in certain sections of the country. We would certainly have had chaos in some of the schools.

Thank you, gentlemen, for your appearance here today. You have been very helpful.

Our next witnesses are representatives of the Ohio Education Association of Teachers, William C. McDonald, president of the Ohio Education Association, Anthony Warren, Federal Services Coordinator of the Ohio Education Association and Doris Allen of the Ohio Education Association.

Go ahead, Dr. McDonald, and present your views. We are delighted to welcome you here. We have got educational problems all over the country. I know you have your part of them. You have some schools that have been closed and we would like to hear what suggestions you can give the committee.

STATEMENTS OF REPRESENTATIVES OF OHIO EDUCATION ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS BY WILLIAM C. McDONALD, PRESIDENT; ANTHONY C. WARREN, FEDERAL SERVICES COORDINATOR; DORIS ALLEN, TITLE I TEACHERS, COLUMBUS, OHIO

Mr. MCDONALD. Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for the opportunity to be here.

Mr. Chairman, and distinguished members of the committee, I am William McDonald, president of the Ohio Education Association, an affiliate of the National Education Association. On behalf of the school-

children of Ohio and 80,000 members of OEA, I am honored to have this opportunity to appear before this committee to express the association's views and concerns on Federal support for elementary and secondary education, and the future direction of that Federal support.

With me are Miss Doris Allen, a title I teacher in the Columbus Ohio School system and Mr. Tony Warren is OEA's Coordinator for Federal Services. These are critical times, times when schoolmen and legislators must sit down, talk, and listen.

Recent developments in Ohio and across the Nation have made it paramount that in order to meet the financial needs of schoolchildren in this country a partnership must be developed and fostered, and that partnership must have three elements in it for the effective financing of the Nation's schools.

1. Locally determined needs and locally supported schools locally controlled.

2. State responsibility for the financial backing of schools.

3. Federal concern in those problems that transcend local and State boundaries. Let us focus our attention first on State and local roles in this partnership for funding schools, and also give you some background on what has been happening in Ohio.

Despite the biggest boost in State support of schools in Ohio history, spending for Ohio's public schools this year will still be well below national levels. According to estimates of school statistics, 1971–72, released by the National Education Association, State governments nationwide are supplying an average of 41 percent of the cost of public schools, while in Ohio, State government contributes 30.5 percent.

Elementary and secondary schools in Ohio will receive more than $2.16 billion this school year from all sources, compared with last year's total of $1.98 billion, an increase of $180 million. This brings the per pupil spending in Ohio up to $812, an increase of $72 per child over last year but not enough to match the national average of $867 per pupil.

Per pupil expenditures vary widely from State to State and from a high of $1,322 in New York to a low of $511 in Alabama. Although dollar support from local school districts in Ohio will increase by $64.9 million this year the local tax share of the total school revenue will drop from 65.8 percent to 63.3 percent.

I am sure that you, as much of the Nation, are aware that over the last 5 years Ohio has had more school closings than the rest of the Nation combined. In 1971 we had 30 school districts that filed audits with the State department of education in order that they might close their schools due to bankruptcy.

These figures, however important, are meaningless unless looked at in the framework of current trends. In 1950, in Ohio, 100 percent of all the levies on the ballot passed for schools. In the last 20 years there has been a steady decline from that 100 percent.

Last November, only 38 percent of the money issues on the ballot for schools passed in the State of Ohio. I think this is an indication if we look from 1969 through 1971, the percentage of renewals has not fallen drastically in the general elections from 99 percent to 98.

However, when we look at the new tax levies, in 1969 through 1971, we find that in the general elections we have dropped from 51 percent to 38 percent.

But aside from the decreasing support property taxpayers are giving to Ohio schools there are other problems. The very nature of the property tax as a major source of school revenue is being challenged. The Ohio Education Association has filed suit in U.S. Federal District Court, in Columbus, Ohio, to have the present system of financing public schools in Ohio declared unconstitutional.

The suit points out that the present school financing system in Ohio based on local property wealth in each district violates the "equal protection clause" of the 14th amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

Data shows that revenues for school purposes vary widely across the State of Ohio with Cuyahoga Heights, near Cleveland, having an assessed valuation per pupil of more than $183,000 per child. On the other end of the scale, the valuation per pupil in the Huntington Local School District in Ross County, in rural Appalachia where I come from, was $3,100 per child.

To bring it more into focus, the people at Huntington Local School District would have to vote 63 notes to every one note in Cuyahoga Heights to raise an equal number of dollars to pay their school program.

Expenditures for school purposes also show a wide range of $2,705 to a low of $450 per child. With Ohio joining California, Minnesota, Texas, and New Jersey in challenging the heavy reliance on the property tax the picture is clear that new sources of revenue for schools must be found.

Even if these situations are effectively solved through the partnership that I alluded to earlier, the crisis in our urban and rural areas for the urban and rural poor will still be of vast proportions.

With your permission, Mr. Warren and Miss Allen will discuss the general fiscal problems affecting Ohio's urban centers and the impact of title I in one of these urban centers.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, I am Tony Warren, Coordinator of Federal Services for the Ohio Education Association. I want to express my appreciation for an invitation to appear before this distinquished committee.

As Mr. McDonald pointed out, these are critical times, times when yesterday's solutions cannot be applied to today's problems. The financial problems of our urban centers are severe.

Dollars for governmental purposes are hard to come by in central cities, but educational dollars are the hardest of all to find because general governmental service needs place such a heavy burden on city taxpayers.

Couple this with a shift in population and business activities out of the city toward the suburbs, a deterioration of the property tax base, a high service requirement in the cities, and an increased cost of education for youngsters in the central cities and it is easy to see that the urban school district is a financial wasteland.

Therefore, it is imperative that some level of government fill this void. Several general conclusions can be drawn about the impact of Federal aid to education and the ability to cope with the problems of the cities. Title I of the ESEA, despite problems, has been an important and welcome source of funds to cities.

Its size, in comparison with other educational programs, title I representing about 40 percent of Federal aid to public schools, has

made an aggregate impact under which cities appear to get their share of the overall Federal funds in an amount proportionate to the population.

However, when we examine the other Federal aid programs individually, we find that many of them, even programs such as vocational education, are of far more assistance to the more favored suburban areas.

Thus, although Federal aid funds taken as a whole may provide the cities as a whole with a share proportionate to their percentage of the population, there is a serious lack of even distribution of funds given for particular individual programs to individual metropolitan areas.

Relative allocations, distributed by individual programs, seldom reflect size or extent of need of the target population. Federal aid needs to assist urban areas to a greater degree. There needs to be an increase in the amount of categorical aid to the cities of Ohio.

If anything, the relevant cost factors of 1965, when ESEA was authorized by this committee, have gone up and, therefore, upward movement in authorization should immediately occur along with full appropriations for those categorical programs. Coupled with inflation, the actual dollar amounts flowing to the cities are low with regard to increases in per pupil expenditure.

The current levels of funding barely provide assistance for operational expenses. While it is true that money alone cannot guarantee educational program effectiveness, it is equally true that without first providing survival operational funds and second, massive educational funds to plan, develop, staff, program, and implement the type of education which produces useful urban citizens, there is no chance for success.

Program failures do occur through lack of commitment, lack of expertise, and/or attitudes which anticipate failure. But one point must be brought home and that is that program failure must occur, must, mind you, occur when there is a desperate lack of sufficient funds to pay for what is needed.

It disturbs us in Ohio when we see that the proposed budget of $4.95 billion for education requested by the administration falls far short of the amounts authorized for existing programs.

The proposed cut of $138 million seriously jeopardizes what have proved to be among the most effective Federal aids to local public schools. But the agonizing question still remains, can increased dollars create better school programs if we view the funding of public schools in this country as a partnership among local, State, and Federal levels of Government.

Then the future direction of funding public schools in this country must place a great deal of emphasis on increasing Federal participation in that partnership. There are several options open to the Federal Government. One is to fully fund categorical programs as authorized by the Congress and two, to devise a system to reduce the heavy reliance on property tax for funding schools by federally putting public schools through a general aid concept. Several mechanisms are currently being considered, revenue sharing and a value-added tax.

We will comment on these approaches if the chairman desires, after our testimony. At this time, Mr. Chairman, with your permission, Miss Allen will discuss her experiences with title I.

Miss ALLEN. Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and distinguished members. My name is Doris Allen from Columbia, Ohio. I teach in an elementary school that is involved with many of the title I programs that have proven to be successful. I do have some guidelines here that we follow that deal with the programs involved in our school. With your permission I will read them.

Special programs for educationally deprived pupils. The purpose of this program is to provide a planned and organized educational program for preschool pupils. Each class is composed of a maximum of 15 pupils who attend on a half-day basis. Prekindergarten teachers are supported by volunteer aides and aides funded by the State program.

The kindergarten primary language development program which I am a part of focuses primary attention on a broad base of educational experiences for primary children. These experiences provide an opportunity for children to extend their language skills through processes of listening, speaking, and writing by working with a language development teacher in a small group situation.

The intermediate languages program is a program providing specialized concentrated reading instruction in grades 4 through 6 for pupils who are achieving at a level below the grade placement. Pupils with special needs are served by language development teachers which have special facilities which are fully supplied with equipment and materials especially selected for the development of reading skills.

The mathematic improvement program specializes in improving mathematic instruction for students who are not achieving at a level commensurate with their ability. Students requiring this concentrated instruction are served on a regular basis by a mathematics improvement teacher in a facility equipped for this purpose.

We need many more programs even though these programs serve their purpose. But, because of our own particular situation, and I can only speak to that because this is where I work, if we had more teachers we could serve many more children.

The majority of our children need additional help and we are confined, in a sense, to guidelines so that we cannot expand in many areas where it may assist the children, to carry them through primarily in the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades. There are only two reading specialists in our building that serve approximately 400 or 500 children and most of the children on that level are at least 2 to 3 years below their grade level. Then, they are ill prepared to go on to junior high.

I will be happy to answer any questions I possibly can.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me ask a question of Dr. McDonald. Do you have any schools, elementary or secondary schools, presently closed?

Mr. MCDONALD. No; not at the present time, Mr. Chairman. However, we did up to as short a period of time ago as December. In fact, one of our urban schools in Dayton had to close for a week during that period of time when they ran out of funds. They were successful, after several attempts, in getting a local levy passed to extend for about 12½ months.

Chairman PERKINS. As the State school superintendent, how has title I improved the quality of your education programs at the elementary level?

Mr. McDONALD. Specifically, as I view it, the greatest improvement is in the area of reading, which I believe is the most important area in elementary education that we can deal with. In a normal situation a child spends the first 3 years in learning to read and if he doesn't learn to read in those 3 years, he is going to have difficulties from there on.

As I view the title I program that Miss Allen spoke about, this not only aids the child that is in that program but it also aids the entire class in that by taking these children out into a special program where they can get more individualized attention to help them with their problem, it also eliminates that time consumption with the regular classroom teacher so she can move ahead more quickly and more in depth with the regular class room situation.

So I can see it benefits not just a few children but the entire population.

Chairman PERKINS. You have had considerable experience out there in Ohio in the last few years. How should the Congress, in your judgment, approach this problem? Should we go to a general aid bill right now, or should we fully fund the categorical programs such as title I before we do that?

Mr. McDONALD. Of course, understanding the political ramifications involved, Mr. Chairman, I can't perceive that we are going to get vast general funding immediately. I think we should have full funding of the total program in the meantime and move quickly toward general funding.

Chairman PERKINS. If we could get $2 billion extra this year for education before the House Committee on Appropriations where would you suggest to the committee that it be placed?

Mr. McDONALD. I think title I would be an appropriate place to put it, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. In preference to all other educational programs?

Mr. McDONALD. Of course I am not trying to establish priorities for the committee or for the Congress. I am viewing it through my own eyes, realizing the importance of title II and some of the other title programs. I believe title I deals most directly with boys and girls and whatever their weaknesses are. I believe this is a proper place to put it if we can get the money.

Chairman PERKINS. At what stage of the game would you suggest we go to general aid? I mean from a standpoint of additional funding. At what stage of the game would you suggest we go to Federal aid, assuming we can get the funds appropriated?

Mr. McDONALD. I am not sure I understand the question.

Chairman PERKINS. Where, along the line, should we go to general aid—go in that direction? I mean, on top of the present program.

Mr. McDONALD. I will let Tony respond to that.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, if I may, I think it is very clear that when ESEA was formulated by this committee, and in the reams of testimony presented before this committee, and the authorization levels that were spelled out, I think the committee took a look at what was needed and what needed to be done, the dollar level at which these programs should be funded.

I cannot see, frankly, going to a general aid program until these programs are fully funded.

Chairman PERKINS. You would not suggest that we go to general aid before these programs are fully funded?

Mr. WARREN. Let me put this in the context of *Serrano* v. *Priest*, the Texas decision, New Jersey, that we might be forced in terms of decisions by the court to move in that direction faster than the political environment might require.

But, it seems to me you pointed out earlier this morning that the elements which were in the mix that contributed to the passage of categorical aid back in 1965 have now shifted. I think we are moving to a situation where the political authorities are bringing us very fast to a position where the Federal Government is going to have to play a major role in this partnership.

Again, it seems to me—and I am from an urban background and Mr. McDonald is from a rural background, Miss Allen is from an urban background—we all have come from situations where we see youngsters with specific problems and if we move to general aid and disregard all of those problems in those particular areas I think we are making a mistake.

So my recommendation in long-range planning from a Federal level is that the Federal Government must first define its role and what it wants to do in education. It has already pointed out that it wants to move in the area of meeting the special needs of the urban child and the poor child.

Then, on top of that, build to developing a good comprehensive financing program for all of the schools in the Nation.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much. You have been most helpful.

Mr. WARREN. May I make one other comment, Mr. Chairman. We know of all the work you have done in the past and that this committee has done in the past——

Chairman PERKINS. We are going to do our best.

Mr. WARREN. We are going to do our best as representative teachers to make it work too.

Chairman PERKINS. I know the Federal Government must become a better partner and must give much more support. The question is the direction that we are going to go presently. Thank you.

Mr. Pucinski, will you introduce our next witness.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, we are happy to have Miss Blanche Erst here this afternoon to testify on this very important legislation. Miss Erst is the immediate past president of the Illinois Education Association and she is now deeply involved in trying to give the teachers of Illinois a greater voice in the body politic as chairman of IPACE, the Illinois Political Action Committee in Education, and we are pleased that she is here to put into perspective the educational needs of our State.

We in Illinois have a very hard-working Illinois Education Association. They have done a tremendous job in providing leadership in the field of education. They fight hard in the State legislature and they are going to be testifying before us again very shortly on additional legislation for providing aid to our school districts.

I am most pleased that we are able to have the very wise advice of Miss Erst this afternoon and I welcome her to our committee.

Chairman PERKINS. Miss. Erst, let me confirm the remarks made by my distinguished colleague, Mr. Pucinski.

Roman Pucinski has always been one of the most dedicated supporters of education that has ever come to this Congress and he has contributed as much as any other individual that I know about here in the Congress.

It is a great pleasure for me to concur with Congressman Pucinski's statement in welcoming you here. I know that you have done a great job for the teaching profession in your State and from that training and experience you are qualified to give us some good suggestions.

STATEMENT OF BLANCHE M. ERST, CHAIRMAN, ILLINOIS POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE IN EDUCATION

Miss ERST. Thank you, Congressman Perkins. I concur I am very interested in Mr. Pucinski's future also. We do realize all the things he has done for us in our State and in the Nation, too.

I appear before you today as a classroom teacher. I have been very fortunate in having been able to represent over 60,000 classroom teachers throughout the last year. I have not brought any statistics for you. I would probably just parrot things if I did and I don't think that is what you want.

But I have been very fortunate in being able to talk to so many teachers throughout the State and know how much this Federal aid has done for our schools in Illinois. Many of them could not exist actually without the Federal aid that you people have given us.

Chairman PERKINS. You have been a classroom teacher I presume?

Miss ERST. I am a classroom teacher. I have not myself been involved in a school district which has actually had much Federal aid, coming from a fairly wealthy suburb of Chicago. However, in this past year, traveling probably some 30,000 miles in a car, I have heard from many, many of the teachers who are very worried about the situations that they are facing.

I do not represent the city of Chicago, however, I myself am very worried about them and the aid that is necessary because of the areas of Federal housing, places of this sort, where we need to have more funding for the schools. I worry for the schools in the city of Chicago as I do especially for the area right near your State of Kentucky down in Cairo where we are facing the fact that some of those schools will have to close.

We do feel that we have to have more aid and we, of course, are backing our affiliate—we are an affiliate of the National Education Association—and their ideas for general aid. We have seen, of course, the great things that have been done with the titles, especially title I, and we would like to see this continued.

We are very, very anxious that public education will be fully funded and that we won't have to rely, as you have heard in too much testimony already today, on real estate taxes. In the State of Illinois, the Illinois Education Association was instrumental in promoting, especially with our teachers and others, the income tax. We feel we have

done everything we possibly can to help in our State to raise moneys for our schools. We do feel that we have to have additional Federal funding.

I guess that is about it.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Pucinski.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Our Nation as against all others or most other major nations of the world spends only 6 percent of its total gross annual resources for education, as against 9.1 percent in Canada, 9.7 percent in Israel, despite the fact that Israel is carrying this tremendous national defense budget to protect her country, the Scandinavin countries spend some 8 percent, even the Soviet Union spends 7.1 percent, the United States spends somewhere in the area of 6 percent.

With that sort of a statistic, it would occur to me that we could well afford to move toward a general aid bill giving the States some meaningful assistance without disturbing this particular concept of title I because title I has always been considered as a compensatory education program designed for the specific needs of children with those needs.

What I would correct in assuming, Miss Erst, what your own position would be is that we do not disturb the ongoing title I program or ESEA when we talk about additional legislation.

Miss ERST. There are far too many fine programs that actually weren't fully funded either. One statistic I was reading recently is, in the reading program in Illinois where we were using some of the title I funds—are using them I should say—students have gone up 1 month in reading ability for 1 month in the programs we have set up. I think this is a step in the right direction. We would like to continue this and anything we can do to help any of these culturally deprived children.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Miss Erst, I was wondering if you would care to comment on a statement made earlier this morning by another witness, Dr. George Oser of the Houston School District, who said that when we talk about pleas for no strings and local control that we should look behind these words for what they really mean so that the legislation that results really meets the needs of youngsters throughout our great country whose futures depend so ultimately upon our decisions.

By this I presume that Dr. Oser was telling us that categorical aid programs are still very necessary to meet specific needs of youngsters that otherwise probably would not be met in the absence of a program like title I. Would you concur in that statement?

Miss ERST. Very much so. This is very necessary for specifics. But I am also, of course, hoping that we will get, in the very near future, some general aid without some of these strings attached also.

I think the accountability of teachers and the administrators, of course, too, will prove that we can handle these things and produce some very fine programs.

Mr. PUCINSKI. As I see this, what we need in view of the recent court decisions is shifting of the financing of education away from the local tax base, property taxes and real estate taxes, to a State obligation.

What we need now is a program of Federal assistance to the States to meet that basic obligation. Then, we need to continue programs like this title I program and other categorical programs to meet the addi-

tional special needs of children for which these programs were designed. Is that a fair statement?

Miss ERST. That is a very fine one. I will go along with that very much.

Mr. PUCINSKI. We are delighted to have you here. I am sure glad you are in Illinois working for us.

Miss ERST. Thank you.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Thank you, Miss Erst.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Ford.

Mr. FORD. I would like to yield.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Brademas, do you have any questions?

Mr. BRADEMAS. No, only that I want to comment from a neighboring State to the next Senator from Illinois. I want to commend you on the fine statement you have made and tell you how fortunate you are to have such a champion of schools for American children in Congressman Pucinski.

Miss ERST. Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much.

The next witnesses are representatives from the Indiana Education Association of Teachers. Congressman Brademas who is one of the outstanding men in the Congress and a great educational leader will introduce you gentlemen at this point.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I want to take this opportunity to say how pleased I am to see spokesmen from schools of my district here, Mr. Hirschinger and Mr. Bianchi. We look forward to hearing from them.

I know there is new leadership in the Indiana State Teachers Association and I look forward to meeting the successor to Mr. Wyatt who has done so much for the schools of our State.

I would ask you just one question, if I may, at the outset, even before you have testified. As you gentlemen both know, the chief State school officer of the State of Indiana, John Laughlin, the superintendent of State public instruction, is from South Bend and is himself a former school teacher.

Superintendent Laughlin urged a few weeks ago that the State of Indiana eventually assume 75 percent of the operating costs of local public schools. I wonder if you could give us any comments you may have on Mr. Laughlin's suggestion with an eye toward the relationship between increased State assistance to elementary and secondary schools, the *Serrano* and other recent decisions in State and Federal courts with respect to the impact of the 14th amendment and property taxes, and an appropriate role for the Federal Government in supporting elementary and secondary schools?

I think you are aware of the important interrelationships of those various factors. Would you care to address yourself to those questions?

STATEMENT OF JIM HIRSCHINGER, INDIANA STATE TEACHERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. HIRSCHINGER. In regard to State Superintendent Laughlin's statement in the paper regarding the 75 percent State aid, personally

I feel this would put the funding of schools out of proportion as much as it is right now.

Right now we are funding schools far too heavily at the local level. I believe 75 percent State aid would put far too much pressure at the State level. I would personally favor a more equitable distribution.

I would like to think in terms of perhaps 50 percent coming from the State, 25 percent as the local portion along with the 25 percent Federal portion, with local and State control so that the control of the schools still remains in the local communities. Bill, would you like to add to that?

Mr. BIANCHI. Basically, if I understand what John is talking about, he is not necessarily saying 75 percent of that money would come only from the State sources. It would be regulated through the State which would mean there would be an alliance with the Federal Government to allow that funding to come in. I can't say that isn't appropriate for an amount of dollars on a State basis as long as you are going to have the assistance of the Federal Government.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Just one final question, Mr. Chairman, because I don't want to hold the witnesses up from making their own statements.

What comment do you have to make on the relationship between appropriations and authorizations as far as Federal aid to schools is concerned? What I particularly have in mind is title I of ESEA.

Mr. HIRSCHINGER. If I understand your question, Congressman, the authorizations are fine. The appropriations have not been enough. We need to have more money appropriated to meet the funding that is authorized.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Have you found title I effective educationally speaking in your experience in Indiana schools?

Mr. HIRSCHINGER. Very much so.

Mr. BRADEMAS. In what way?

Mr. HIRSCHINGER. It has reached children and provided educational programs for children in these target areas with below income levels and who are educably retarded. They would not otherwise have been reached by any program that could have been offered at the local and State level. The local and State levels are not providing funds for these programs and the Federal input in the title I area has been vastly important to provide this type of program for these children.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent following this colloquy that I have had with the two witnesses from Indiana that there be inserted in the record the text of several articles from a fall 1971 issue of the Notre Dame Journal of Education?

Chairman PERKINS. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The document to be furnished follows:)

Urban Education*

WHITNEY M. YOUNG, JR.
Late Executive Director of the National Urban League,
New York, New York

The following article contains excerpts from Whitney M. Young's last book — *Beyond Racism*. Mr. Young had agreed to do an article on urban education for the NOTRE DAME JOURNAL OF EDUCATION but his unfortunate death prevented it. We have reprinted these excerpts dealing with urban education because of the valuable insights the late Whitney M. Young, Jr., provided regarding this important but perplexing problem.

* * *

America's educational system was created not only to provide people with the skills needed by our society but also to transmit to young people society's values and beliefs. If we accept the fact that racism is one of our most cherished values, then the schools have succeeded admirably, for they, more than any other institution, have perpetuated racism and destroyed countless black children in the process.

Black children actually fall farther behind the longer they stay in school. Black sixth-graders are two and a half years behind white sixth-graders; by the time they have become seniors in high school the gap has grown to three and a half years. Educators like to think that this is the fault of the children, but the Head Start program has proved otherwise. Black three- and four-year-olds who got early schooling in the program actually did get a "head start," but once they fell into the clutches of the school system they lost their lead over youngsters who didn't get preschool training and proceeded on the treadmill of failure that awaits promising black children in our system of miseducation.

There are plenty of reasons for the failure of the schools to educate black youngsters, but all of them come down to the same basic racism that poisons the rest of American life. School districts refusing to implement the fifteen-year-old Supreme Court ruling that declared segregated schools unconstitutional set an example of lawlessness in a defense of racism.

Integration works. It is as valuable for white youngsters as it is for black. In a world that is three quarters nonwhite, no white parent can afford the luxury of limiting his child's experience to all-white schools, classmates, and friends. Integrated schools work for black children, too. Studies show that their achievement is higher there than it is in all-black schools. That's because schools with majority white enrollments are favored by school boards and communities alike. They get the resources and the interest denied ghetto schools that are stigmatized

* From *Beyond Racism* by Whitney M. Young, Jr. Copyright 1969 by Whitney M. Young, Jr. Used with permission of McGraw-Hill Book Company.

as "inferior" and whose children — and their parents — are held in contempt.

But despite repeated demonstrations of the value of integrated schools, districts, North and South, go to extraordinary lengths to keep them segregated. Cincinnati, for example, bused children from an overcrowded black school past several predominately white schools to another nearly all-black school five and a half miles away. Federal investigators found that more than four out of five Cleveland schoolchildren go to schools that are over 95 per cent or more white or over 95 per cent Negro. Enforcement of the Supreme Court's ruling has been all but nonexistent, thanks to Congressional opposition, local resistance, and the lack of funds for enforcement. As the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights put it, "Racial isolation in the schools . . . is intense whether the cities are large or small, whether the proportion of Negro enrollment is large or small, whether they are located in the North or South."

So we are left with segregated schools and predominately black schools that are as unequal as they are separate. Black students get the worst schools, the least-trained teachers, and the worst equipment. Thirty Detroit ghetto schools were built in the administration of President Grant — a hundred years ago. Ghetto schools are not only older, they are also overcrowded. Over half of Chicago's predominately black high schools have enrollments more than 50 per cent *above* capacity, but less than a sixth of the predominately white high schools are that full. In city after city, thirty-five and forty black kids are crammed into each classroom in rotting buildings, while excess seating capacity goes unused in all-white schools elsewhere.

Black schools lack the facilities to teach children skills needed in today's technological world. Barely half of Washington's ghetto elementary schools have libraries. The Coleman Report of the U.S. Office of Education says that Negro pupils ". . . have less access to physics, chemistry and language laboratories; there are fewer books per pupil in their libraries; the textbooks are less often in sufficient supply."

From some of the textbooks I've seen, perhaps that lack isn't such a bad one after all. Our children—all of them, white and black—are being poisoned by textbooks that are either unrealistic or outright racist. History texts, especially, have wounded black children and lied to white kids with racist fantasies of a past that never was. This example comes from a book, *The Growth of the American Republic,* published in 1940 by two of the most famous historians of our time, Samuel Eliot Morison and Henry Steele Commager:

> As for Sambo, whose wrongs moved the abolitionists to wrath and tears, there is some reason to believe that he suffered less than any other class in the South from its "peculiar institution." The majority of the slaves were adequately fed, well cared for, and apparently happy. . . . Although brought to America by force, the incurably optimistic Negro soon became attached to the country, and devoted to his "white folks."

Books such as this helped produce a nation of racists who believe that whites are superior to blacks. Small wonder Americans are shocked by the anger and pain that well up from the ghetto's devoted "Sambos." When books take a

more positive approach to the black people in our history, it is usually the "safe" black man whose life is taught—Booker T. Washington, who urged Negroes to reach an accommodation with White America, rather than Frederick Douglass or W. E. B. DuBois, who fought segregation and insisted on equal rights.

Racism is not confined to academic subjects. Black kids are crammed into vocational schools that are supposed to prepare them for skilled jobs, but don't. Outmoded equipment is used to teach skills that are becoming outmoded themselves. These schools are disaster areas, hothouses of frustration. The black dropout rate in ghetto schools is in the neighborhood of 50 per cent.

The massive amount of money needed to make these schools function is nowhere in sight. Cleveland spends $578 per pupil during the school year, suburban Cuyahoga Heights $1344. The Great Cities Program for School Improvement, made up of sixteen of the largest urban school districts in the country, stated: "Big city schools generally have two-thirds or less to spend per pupil than do the schools in the adjacent suburbs." White America's scarce educational resources are funneled into schools that contain white children, and the black children—for whom education is the only road out of poverty—get the leavings.

The disparity in resources even results in gnawing hunger for black children. Six million children qualify for free school lunches, but only a third get them. One St. Louis school has a thousand children from welfare families, but only a dozen get free lunches. The rest go hungry. Some of this hunger is caused by lack of facilities to prepare food in the ancient buildings that serve ghetto students. In Detroit, seventy-eight of the seventy-nine schools that have no lunch program because of lack of facilities are in the ghetto. Not one of Cleveland's elementary schools has its own lunch program.

Ghetto schools get the most inexperienced teachers and have the highest turnover rates. The average turnover in New York City teaching staffs is about 10 per cent; in East Harlem it is 20 to 25 per cent. In forty nearly all-black or Puerto Rican schools, half the teachers had less than three years' experience, double the rate for white schools. The slum child needs a host of special services as well as good teachers, but the average slum school has only forty professional staff members per thousand students; the suburban schools have seventy per thousand.

All of these facts and statistics measure the failure of White America to educate black youth, but the most pernicious element in the destruction of our children is the contempt in which they are held by the educational establishment. *Black kids fail because they are expected to fail and because the whole system of American education is designed to encourage their failure.*

Teaching staffs are often made up of people whose attitudes combine fear with ill-concealed contempt. Teachers are not immune to the racism of the society of which they are a part. If they expected their students to succeed and if they imparted to black students a sense of worth and dignity, *those children would succeed.* Ghetto children have to overcome not only the poverty and despair of the slums, but also systematic destruction of their ability to learn, a destruction that is fostered by the hostility of many of their own teachers and counselors.

79-838 O - 72 - 6

A Harvard psychology professor has proved that teachers' attitudes affect the performance of their students. He conducted an experiment in a San Francisco elementary school with a large Mexican-American enrollment. All students were given an IQ test, then a random sampling of names was selected. Teachers were told that the test indicated which students were due to spurt ahead in achievement in the coming year. It wasn't true, of course, but the teachers believed it. A year later, the students were tested again. Sure enough, the ones picked at random actually did achieve better scores; in the earlier grades they scored IQ gains more than double those of other children.

Why? Because their teachers actually believed they would achieve this, thanks to the false information they had been given. In hundreds of little ways during that school year, they conveyed that belief to their students and encouraged them to do better. Children who had been neglected were called on to answer classroom questions and a wrong answer didn't result in "That's all right, Johnny, you just don't know better," but in "Sure you know the answer to that one," followed by a hint or a word of encouragement. For some of the children, it was the first time in their entire school experience that a teacher had really cared about their performance.

It is clear from this, and from other experiments in the behavioral sciences, that among the black child's greatest obstacles in learning are his own teacher, his principal, and the whole apparatus of an educational bureaucracy that doesn't believe that black kids are able to (or even that they ought to) learn.

Like much of American racism, these attitudes need not be blatant, in fact they often exist despite protestations of how much the child is loved and respected. But the same defensive mechanism that has enabled black people to survive through 350 years of racism operates like a radar system to detect prejudiced attitudes. Children can detect in a raised eyebrow, in the tone of a voice, in a chance remark a whole range of nuances that tells them they are unwanted and uncared for.

The schools, once the vehicle for Americanizing millions of immigrant children and preparing them for success in our society, have become instruments of destruction for black children. The tragedy of this state of affairs is deepened by the realization that the children of the ghetto are so thirsty for knowledge, so hungry for the success their fathers never knew. These kids exhibit a resilience, an aliveness, an inner strength that the schools could so easily build on. Instead of becoming obsessed with the problems involved, educators must realize that a whole generation of ghetto youth could blossom forth if they would but believe in their students and build on their strengths, strengths that would make it possible for them to survive in a hostile world that would wither lesser spirits.

Dr. John J. Fischer, president of Teachers College at Columbia University, has defined a good school as ". . . one where children know they are welcome and respected, where every day they experience some measure of success, and where they are constantly reminded that what they do really makes a difference."

Such schools do exist in the ghetto—but often outside the regular public school system. The Urban League, for example, established a network of street academies in New York—storefront schools—staffed by street workers who re-

cruit dropouts. The youngsters are motivated to learn and get the remedial help they need to bring themselves up to grade level. But our aim is to show that youngsters pushed out of the incompetent public schools of the ghetto are as capable of going to college as suburban students. Street-academy graduates are placed at prep schools, including the Urban League-sponsored Harlem Prep. Every one of Harlem Prep's 1968 graduating class of seventy was placed in college, an extraordinary record unmatched by the most prestigious schools in the country. Yet these are the same young people who were branded uneducable by the mind-destroying system that crushes black youth.

The success of the street-academy program shows what can be done when schools are bold, imaginative, and responsive to the communities they serve. Even the barrier of race falls. On one visit to Harlem Prep, I talked with a young man who was bitterly antiwhite. "But what about your teacher," I asked. "She's white, yet you get along beautifully with her." "Oh," he answered, "she's not white, she's nice." For this youngster, and for many thousands of others trapped in the slum ghettos of urban America, "white" has taken on connotations of evil, racism, and oppression.

Such an outlook is at least understandable when we consider the way black Americans have been victimized by White Power. It is as if White America has been waging all-out war on black people for the past 350 years.

* * * * *

The urban grant university. Back in 1862, in the midst of the Civil War, Congress passed the Morrill Act, which donated 17 million acres of federal land to the states to create colleges "for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts . . . in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes." These land-grant colleges, now flourishing state universities, were the backbone of American higher education. They enabled millions to go to college, and provided agricultural research and other services for our then-rural economy.

Our nation now needs a similar system of urban grant universities. Colleges now in the cities have failed the urban population. Many of them only make contact with the ghetto surrounding them in the process of "urban-renewing" part of it out of existence, packing the slums tighter with people evicted from their homes by the university's bulldozer.

Urban grant universities should be established in every city of 200,000 or more, not only to provide first-class education, but also to serve the urban communities just as their predecessors served farm communities. They could be a prime resource for community councils, helping to plan community projects, contracting to run schools and hospitals, and providing experts in housing and other areas. They could conduct adult education programs and train people for new careers as semiprofessional aides.

Tuition should be free. Any high school graduate who met course requirements would be admitted, and remedial training would be provided to bring victims of our inadequate inner-city public schools up to college-entrance levels.

College costs are climbing steeply, and there are not enough classroom open-

ings. Despite all the misleading talk about the availability of scholarships, we have set up an income barrier that keeps people from going as far as their potential and skills will permit. This represents an incredible waste of human resources. Some countries not only provide free education right through to postgraduate studies, but they also pay students' living expenses. At the very least, we should establish the principle of the right to free higher education for all who want it and have the ability.

Integrating the schools. Few issues arouse so much emotion as bringing white and black children together in the public schools. Many white parents in the North were all in favor of school desegregation when they saw television films of parents in Little Rock and New Orleans screaming obscenities at six-year-old black children. But when it came to their own kids' schools, which were just as segregated as those in the South, many of the same people suddenly found that they were concerned about preserving the (all-white) "neighborhood school." The parents who boasted of riding miles to school in their youth, and who now bus their kids clear across town to private schools, are often the people who wail the loudest about busing public school children.

But school integration is vital for all children—white and black. It is important for the black child because, so long as ghetto schools remain inferior institutions, his best hope for a quality education lies in attending the predominately white schools that now get the best teachers, books, and equipment. White children, on the other hand, are in danger of growing up in an educational hothouse, unprepared for the real world. As the former head of the Darien, Connecticut, school system, Dr. Gregory C. Coffin, stated when he resigned that post, ". . . because of their money and their position, these kids will probably be leaders, and they're being prepared for that role with only a wildly unrealistic view of life."

As the more affluent whites move to the suburbs or send their children to private schools, urban school systems become blacker. Black children are already in the majority in the public schools of Chicago, Detroit, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, and other cities; they comprise 95 per cent of Washington, D.C.'s, school population.

Whatever the reason for it—urban housing patterns or Southern defiance—school segregation is illegal and an intolerable obstacle to an Open Society. Strict enforcement of the law has been hampered by Congressional pressures and inadequate funds for investigation and enforcement officers. Also, the main threat in the enforcement arsenal—cutting off federal funds—is like the atom bomb: too damaging to all concerned to be of tactical use. When Southern states barred black citizens from voting, the government sent in federal registrars, who took over the job of registering voters. This precedent could be followed in enforcing desegregation. When a school district breaks the law by ignoring court desegregation orders, the federal government should be empowered to dismiss the lawbreakers, replacing them with a new board of qualified local citizens pledged to carry out the law.

Busing, pairing of schools, and other feasible techniques should be used to encourage integration. And suburban schools shouldn't be exempt. Incentives

could be offered to suburban districts to accept inner-city children or to arrange for pupil exchanges. Even without such incentives, Hartford's suburban schools accepted 800 black children from the city; similar programs elsewhere have proved successful.

Perhaps the most promising technique for achieving educational excellence as well as integration is the educational park. An educational park is a complex that clusters several schools, of all levels, in one central location. Like an advanced medical center, its very size means it can afford expensive teaching tools and facilities that would be out of reach for a single school. Because it draws its pupils from a wide area of the city, it breaks down neighborhood racial barriers. Federal grants could be provided to induce cities to build these better schools, just as such grants are available to cities to build highways.

Improving the public schools. Integration is no panacea. Children—black and white—are not getting the quality education this country is capable of providing. Even the "good" schools are more concerned with programming children to pass tests than they are with fostering human values. The public schools could be rehabilitated with more money, more parent participation, and better teaching.

City schools are strapped for money. Voters, bristling under high taxes, can be counted on to kill school bond issues. Federal money clearly has to be put into local school systems. The Office of Education should declare a minimum level of per-pupil spending, and then make up the difference between that level and what local communities can afford to pay for schools. A minimum local school tax rate should be set to prevent localities from simply shifting their responsibilities onto Washington. In addition to providing more funds, this would equalize pupil expenditures between suburban systems that spend $1500 per pupil and ghetto schools that spend $500. Bonus allotments should be made available to low-achievement school districts for reading specialists, teaching machines, or other needed programs that would bring them up to standard. Ghetto schools, especially, have to be saturated with special services to overcome the handicaps of the slum environment.

But this money would be wasted if it were simply funneled through the present incompetent bureaucracies that have made the public schools a sanctuary for security-minded people who don't care about developing their students' potentials. The schools might as well shut up shop if their administrators don't agree to share control with concerned parents. As the Bundy Report on New York City school decentralization stated, "There is an intimate relation between the community and the ability of public education to function effectively . . . [if] the community regards the school as an agency in which they have an investment, which acknowledges a responsibility for pupil achievement—in short, as their own —children will enter the school with positive expectations."

This implies a drastic shift in power. School administrators, teachers, and unions will have to surrender a part of their power to parents. Their refusal to do this nearly wrecked New York City in 1968, when the teachers' union called three strikes that demanded elimination of effective decentralization of the schools. Its intentions were clouded by charges of violation of due process, harassment, and anti-Semitism, but the real issue was power. The teachers (or at

least the ones who struck—a large minority broke into the schools to teach their pupils) were backed by supervisors and principals fearful that schools controlled by the community wouldn't stick to the old civil service promotion lists in hiring supervisory staff.

Decentralization may represent a threat to the present holders of power, but it represents the hope of a new day for children, parents, and teachers. I visited the embattled Ocean Hill-Brownsville school district that was the focal point of the New York strikes. This experimental district was sabotaged from the beginning by forces that wanted it to fail, and it was beset by public controversy. Racial "militants" seeking a confrontation with the police and the striking teachers added to the district's problems. The ability of the teachers and administrators to keep these self-proclaimed "leaders" from speaking for them and for the community, as well as what I observed in the schools, confirmed my faith in the concept of community control.

Youngsters were learning as never before. They were reading and learning math and making progress that was unheard of under the old system. They were being taught black history and black culture—but they also got lessons on the meaning of Rosh Hashanah and other Jewish holidays, as well as in the customs of other peoples. They were being educated for an Open Society by a young teaching staff that was eager to work in the district. One teacher told me that he could never again teach under the old system, which made teachers afraid to try something new: "We aren't required to serve the system here—just the kids." Another teacher told me how important it was to her to have the help of concerned parents, and parents told me how important the schools had become to the whole community since the experiment began. For the first time, many parents were involved in the schools and participated in their children's education. The schools I saw were no longer the usual ghetto failure factories—they were schools that met the needs of the children, fulfilled the hopes of their parents, and gave their teachers a strong new joy in their work.

Even with additional funds and parent participation, public education will fail unless it attracts dedicated teachers like the ones I met in Ocean Hill-Brownsville. As Kenneth Clark has said, "A normal child who is expected to learn, *who is taught* and who is required to learn will learn."

The teaching profession ought to have the recognition it deserves. The present system of lumping all teachers together—the effective with the ineffective—paying them the same salary, and subjecting them to the same restrictions doesn't make sense. Neither does the licensing system, which assumes that accumulating a certain number of credits in educational theory makes a person qualified to teach a child in the ghetto.

I'd like to see a system of teaching internships. Before a teacher could qualify for a full-fledged position, he should teach under the supervision of a master teacher. Creation of the higher-paid post of master teacher would recognize merit and accomplishment in teaching, just as superior accomplishment is rewarded in other fields. Interns could be recruited from Peace Corps returnees, VISTA volunteers, and others who may not meet present license requirements but who exhibit the compassion and the zeal so noticeably lacking in our schools.

The very best teachers ought to be in the ghetto schools, and, as specialists performing the most exacting and demanding work, they should get the rewards due them. Sending inexperienced or unsympathetic teachers into ghetto schools is too much like having interns perform complex heart operations, while the specialists treat healthy people for common colds. If we staffed the schools of the ghetto with master teachers and made these schools accountable to the community we would transform the dying institution of public education.

The Politics and Financing of Urban Education

CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS*
(Democrat, Indiana) Chairman, Select Education Subcommittee, Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives

In discussing the Federal role in urban education, I should like to focus on Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. Title I was intended to provide funds to school districts with high concentrations of low-income families for the purpose of improving the quality of education for disadvantaged children. A number of important critics—ranging from radical intellectuals to a conservative President of the United States—are already contending that Title I has been of little help in curing the problems of urban education.

I want, first, to review these criticisms, then outline some of the problems confronting urban elementary and secondary schools and, finally, comment on some examples of the several political and financial issues that affect Federal education policy—desegregation, aid to nonpublic schools and revenue-sharing proposals. Because Federal funds represent only a small proportion of total spending on elementary and secondary education, I shall also discuss two examples of proposals aimed at stimulating reform at the state and local levels: state-wide financing of elementary and secondary schools and the new voucher experiment. I want as well to touch on two other related Federal legislative initiatives—a comprehensive child development bill and the proposed National Institute of Education, both measures which give promise of significantly improving urban education in the United States.

My observations can be summarized in the following theses: (1) the problems of urban education are indeed serious; (2) much of the despair over finding solutions is nonetheless premature; (3) certain recent developments indicate that despite strong political pressures, reform is still possible; and (4) more systematic research and experimentation about education generally and urban education in particular can help substantially in the effort to reform urban education.

CRITICISMS OF URBAN EDUCATION

In sampling criticisms of urban education, we must recall that it was less than seven years ago, on April 11, 1965, that President Johnson, at the one-room schoolhouse in Stonewall, Texas, where he had first attended school, signed ESEA into law. Johnson said then that no legislation he had "signed or will ever

* These observations on urban education are written from the perspective of a legislator who has served for more than a dozen years on that committee of the House of Representatives, Education and Labor, with principal responsibility for writing Federal programs affecting education.

sign means more to the future of America." A number of critics are already disputing the validity of that prediction.

The voices of discontent are heard everywhere—the White House, polling booths, the mass media, in the polemics of radical critics and in the research reports of government agencies and private organizations. The criticisms, whether directed specifically toward inadequate Federal funding or the shape of Federal education programs or, more generally, toward our failure to develop a sound policy for urban America, deepen the belief that the problems are greater than our ability to solve them.

For example, in his March 1970 message to Congress on education reform, President Nixon said Federal education programs "have not measurably helped poor children catch up."

From Cuernavaca, Mexico, home of the Center for Intercultural Documentation, Ivan Illich, author of *Deschooling Society*, writes: "Between 1965 and 1968 over three billion dollars were spent in U.S. schools to offset the disadvantages of about six million children. The program is known as Title One. It is the most expensive compensatory program ever attempted anywhere in education, yet no significant improvement can be detected in the learning of these disadvantaged children." This "total failure," claims Illich, can be arrested "only by channeling dollars away from the institutions which now treat health, education, and welfare [so that] the further impoverishment resulting from their disabling side effects [can] be stopped." Illich thinks it would take $80 billion per year to provide what educators regard as equal treatment for everyone in elementary and high school.

Henry M. Levin, associate professor of education at Stanford University and author of "Why Ghetto Schools Fail" in the *Saturday Review* of March 21, 1971, says "the record of spending on compensatory education is an outstanding testimony to the futility of doing more of the same things that have not worked in the past."

Echoing Levin's sentiments, Dr. Harvey B. Scribner, chancellor of the public schools in New York City, wrote in the *New York Times* that "if the kind of reform undertaken in the nineteen-sixties proved anything, it proved that for all the spending and all the effort, and despite the successes that were achieved, the basic character of the school was changed very little."

In his controversial article in a 1969 *Harvard Educational Review*, Professor Arthur R. Jensen declares that "compensatory education has been tried and it apparently has failed." After noting that compensatory education "has been practiced on a massive scale for several years in many cities" and that it began with "auspicious enthusiasm" and "unprecedented support from Federal funds," Jensen concludes: "The chief goal of compensatory education—to remedy the educational lag of disadvantaged children and thereby narrow the achievement gap between 'minority' and 'majority' pupils—has been utterly unrealized in any of the large compensatory education programs that have been evaluated so far."

And in early 1971, the Committee for Economic Development—composed of leading academic and business figures—published a study entitled, *Education for the Urban Disadvantaged*, which began with this harsh judgment: "While

the American schools have generally provided middle- and upper-income youth with the intellectual tools necessary for success in our society, they have commonly failed to cope effectively with the task of educating the disadvantaged youth in our urban centers. To an alarming extent they have simply swept disadvantaged youth under the educational rug."

Many are the scapegoats cited for the continued decline of urban education systems. One theory, advanced by a school of radical critics, holds that an "establishment" has the power to solve the problems, but simply does not want to. Another school argues that an inherent lack of intelligence on the part of the disadvantaged is responsible for present conditions. Indeed, Edward C. Banfield of Harvard, in *The Unheavenly City*, claims that most public programs to educate and train "lower class" people are doomed to failure because of the inability of the "lower classes" to plan ahead.

A more convincing explanation of the shortcomings of our city schools, "the conflicting objectives theory," is offered by Alice M. Rivlin of the Brookings Institution. Rivlin holds that current problems are difficult because they involve conflicts among objectives on which nearly everyone agrees. For example, most persons could be expected to want both to improve the quality of education and to provide the widest possible access to it. But to achieve both of these generally accepted goals simultaneously may entail serious contradictions. In other words, we may simply not know enough to be able to achieve several objectives that are equally valid but that conflict with one another.

There are, it must be pointed out, some authorities who—while deploring the inadequacy of Federal funding levels and the general condition of urban education—defend Federal targeting on the problems of educating the disadvantaged. For example, Joel S. Berke of the Syracuse University Research Corporation writes in the September 1971 *Phi Delta Kappan*: "Title I . . . appears to be an immense fiscal success. Proportionately higher levels of Title I funds go to school systems with (a) lower income levels, (b) higher proportions of non-whites, (c) central city or rural location, and (d) greater educational need as measured by lower mean achievement scores. Put simply, then, despite the many criticisms that have been leveled at it, Title I gets money to places where the fiscal crisis is greatest."

And the *Report of the Task Force on Urban Education*—directed by Wilson C. Riles, now Superintendent of Public Instruction for California—recognizes the usefulness of Title I by calling for its strengthening by: (1) funding at or near the full authorization level; (2) encouraging states to target funds on areas with high concentrations of the disadvantaged; (3) making appropriations in advance; and (4) making public the audits of local and state administration of Title I funds.

All the criticisms of the Title I programs—and the defenses—seem to me premature. In the first place, Title I has been law less than seven years. Surely it takes longer to make conclusive judgments on the effectiveness of a program that is aimed at so complicated a goal as the improvement of the learning of human beings.

Second, we have not really spent much money, relatively speaking, on Title I.

Even now the Federal contribution amounts to less than seven per cent of *all* funds expended on public elementary and secondary education. During the years of its existence, Title I has been constantly competing for public funds with many other priority programs, not to mention the Vietnam War. Indeed, the gap between authorizations and appropriations has always been large. On the average, annual appropriations have been about 50 per cent of authorizations.

And finally, of the Title I money that has been appropriated, some has not been spent as Congress intended, in poor districts, but has been wrongfully expended by many state and local governments as general aid in middle-income districts. In such instances, it makes as much sense to complain about the ineffectiveness of Title I as to chop down an apple tree for not bearing oranges.

Citing an assessment of Title I prepared by the Washington Research Project and the NAACP, A. Harry Passow, in *Urban Education in the 1970's*, comments: "This review of the administration of Title I funds at the local, state, and federal levels raised serious questions about whether the pessimistic evaluations of compensatory programs were due to mismanagement and misapplication of funds rather than to the nature of the programs themselves. The report reinforced observations made earlier that compensatory education had not failed—rather, it had never really been tried as yet."

Principal Problems of Urban Education

It is, then, much too soon to judge with assurance the achievement, or lack of it, of the "major" Federal effort to improve education in some of our most hard-pressed school systems, including urban ones. Yet it is clearly not too soon to cite and to analyze some of the most urgent problems confronting urban education in America. I here list only a few: the need to assimilate the new immigrants to the inner cities, *de facto* segregation, inadequate and inequitable financing and competition from other city services. Nor is it premature to consider proposals currently being advanced to cope with these problems, innovations such as state-wide financing, vouchers, comprehensive child development and the National Institute of Education.

America's urban centers have always borne the brunt of the responsibility to assimilate individuals of varying economic and ethnic backgrounds into the fabric of American life. At the turn of the century, the cities experienced an influx of immigrants, primarily from European countries, whose language and culture prevented "instantaneous Americanization." Today, internal population shifts—from the South and rural areas—contribute to the continual growth of our metropolitan areas.

Yet the new migrants exacerbate the problems of the cities through new demands on them. Racial prejudice makes difficult the assimilation of the more visible minorities, and the lack of marketable skills on the part of many of the minorities decreases their prospects for employment in a technological society.

These burgeoning pressures come at a time when city after city is faced with rapidly rising costs and an eroding tax base. A recent Census Bureau study on city finances shows that for the 1970 fiscal year, cities and municipalities spent

$1.5 billion more than they took in, a much larger lag than for previous years. The flight of middle-income families to the suburbs, leaving center city and its facilities, including schools, decaying and crumbling, has become one of the symbols of the urban dilemma.

Another volatile question in urban education is, of course, race. The 1964 Civil Rights Act provides a cutoff in Federal aid to school districts which practice *de jure* segregation but the enforcement of this requirement by the Nixon Administration is still uneven and a subject of continuing controversy.

But beyond the problem of overcoming the segregation of dual school systems is *de facto* school segregation, chiefly a result of long-established housing patterns and an issue that reaches into every major city in the North. Indeed, President Nixon has said that only 28 per cent of black schoolchildren attend majority white schools in the North.

In his famous 1966 report, Dr. James S. Coleman of Johns Hopkins University said that, at grades 6, 9 and 12, Negroes tested about 1.1 standard deviations below whites in the same grade. But at grade 6, this lag represents 1.6 years behind; at grade 9, 2.4 years; and at grade 12, 3.3 years. Northern Negroes can hardly be said, on the basis of this evidence, to be enjoying equal education.

Given the continuing pattern of *de facto* segregation, one of Coleman's principal findings takes on particular significance: ". . . if a minority pupil from a home without much educational strength is put with schoolmates with strong educational backgrounds, his achievement is likely to increase."

Indeed, the Nixon Administration has this year pressed for Congressional passage of a bill authorizing $1.5 billion in funds to aid school districts seeking to overcome desegregation, both *de facto* and *de jure*. But the President's August 1971 statement voicing opposition to the use of any of the proposed funds for bussing, already a device approved by the Supreme Court where essential to the process of desegregation, has thrown a cloud over the prospects of the bill.

There is also, of course, strong opposition to bussing in Congress. As a result, any attempts to overcome the debilitating effects of racial imbalance based on neighborhood patterns may—it is not yet clear as this is written—have to be undertaken by local officials with little Federal assistance. The role of the Federal government in eliminating *de facto* segregation has thus not yet been defined, and the issue of segregation in the nation's city schools festers on.

The nature of the tax base for financing elementary and secondary education is another question crucial to the future of urban schools. In two words, the typical revenue source for schools—the local property tax—is antiquated and, in terms of ability to pay, unfair.

Total estimated revenue for public elementary and secondary schools in 1970-71 amounted to $41.9 billion. Of this sum, local school districts raised 52 per cent, while the states and the Federal government provided, respectively, 4.1 and 6.9 per cent. Yet fully 98 per cent of the 52 per cent raised by independent school districts came from the local property tax. Not geared to changes in income, the property tax customarily weighs more heavily on the poorer property owner than on the wealthier. This regressive feature of the property tax hits hardest at those whose incomes are fixed or rise more slowly than the average.

Another defect of the tax, of course, results from the uneven distribution of property wealth among school districts. What usually happens is that, even with somewhat greater tax effort, districts with relatively low property valuation end up with less revenue to spend on their schools, while wealthy districts can, with relatively lower taxes, have enough. A ludicrous example of these disparities is the difference in the tax base behind each of the thousand-odd districts in California —a difference that ranges from $103 per child in one district to $952,156 in another. The California Supreme Court recently cited this example in ruling on August 30, 1971, that California's entire system for financing public schools, based primarily on local property taxes, violated the "equal protection" guarantee of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution because the system provided more money for schools in wealthy neighborhoods than in poor areas.

The inequities of the property tax have also helped to fuel discontent in the polling booths. Joel Berke says that 30 school districts in California went bankrupt during the past school year and that voters rejected 60 per cent of the proposed increases in school taxes and new bond issues. In Michigan, 20 of 25 requests for higher property levies were rejected, and 36 of 91 requests to continue current rates also failed to pass. New York State in 1970 almost equalled its all-time high of 120 rejected bond issues. According to the Investment Bankers Association, voters across the country rejected 11 per cent of the school bond issues put before them in 1960; in 1965, 33 per cent; and last year, 52 per cent.

The tremendous demand for public services in urban areas further erodes the tax revenues that might be allotted to education. Moreover, public health, transportation, recreation, safety and sanitation are all services which require proportionately larger expenditures in the inner city than in the suburban rings. The typical suburbanite uses urban services for ten hours a day, then, paying no city taxes, retires to his suburban sanctuary. The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations estimates that over 70 per cent of central city expenditures go for general governmental services, while about half the public expenditures in suburban areas are devoted to such services. Suburbs, therefore, have proportionately more money to spend on education than do the cities.

But even these fewer dollars for urban education must be used more intensively. The educational enterprise is more costly in the city. Students from disadvantaged backgrounds require greater educational services to achieve parity with accepted grade norms, and such students tend to be concentrated in the inner cities. Land, security, insurance, construction and maintenance also cost more in the cities. Mark R. Shedd, Superintendent of the Philadelphia (Pa.) public schools, told a Senate committee recently that his operating budget no longer is able to handle debt-servicing, which has risen from some $10 million in 1965 to $56 million in 1971. The latter figure is equivalent to 16 per cent of his total operating budget!

And teachers, long among the most underpaid professionals in our society, are finally receiving the pay they deserve. Yet teachers' salaries are now by far the costliest item in most school budgets and, especially since the rise of vigorous teachers' unions in the 1960s, these salaries have contributed greatly to the growing financial squeeze on urban school districts. Shedd said the average salaries

of the 13,000 teachers in the Philadelphia schools have risen by $5,300 during the past six years.

Increasing migration of minorities to the cities, *de facto* segregation, insufficient and inequitable financing, competition from other city services — these are only some of the terrible pressures which afflict the nation's urban school systems. This list of the problems is clearly not exhaustive; hopefully, it is instructive.

Nor can I pretend to discuss all the possibilities for improving education in our city schools. A review of several current proposals for reform may, however, be helpful in indicating some rays of light amidst the gloom. As a Federal legislator, I shall, in discussing three of these approaches — more Federal aid for urban education, state-wide financing and vouchers — try to place them in political context, for political implications exist in all three. I shall also discuss two other Federal initiatives — comprehensive child development and the proposed National Institute of Education — which, while encompassing more than purely urban educational problems, promise, over the long run, to bring significant improvement to urban education.

The Federal Effort: Issues and Politics

The financial plight of urban schools has meant increasing pressure on the Federal government to provide a much larger part of the cost of public elementary and secondary education. Unfortunately, those of us in Congress who have fought education's fight over the past decade are only too aware of how difficult the struggle to reorder priorities is, how powerful the advocates of entrenched interests are and how uneven and ephemeral the political coalition for education can be. And the involvement of the Federal government in supporting education continues to be plagued with the thorniest of issues — religion, revenue sharing and race — to cite only three.

In retrospect, the happy confluence of personalities and circumstances that surrounded the passage of ESEA in 1965 seems almost serendipitous. President Johnson had just received more than 60 per cent of the vote in the 1964 election; House Democrats had gained 38 new seats and their Senate colleagues had increasd by two; the escalation of the Vietnam War had not yet occurred; the public still seemed supportive of action on the civil rights and poverty issues; the Office of Education was under the energetic leadership of Francis Keppel; and an ecumenical spirit prevailed between the National Education Association (NEA) and the National Catholic Welfare Conference (now the U.S. Catholic Conference), long-time antagonists over the issue of public support for parochial schools.

The issue of religion was resolved to a degree with the passage of ESEA. Prior to that time, Roman Catholic leaders fought Federal aid proposals that provided no benefits for children in nonpublic schools, while opponents of aid to parochial schools argued that it would breach the Constitutional doctrine separating church from state. The ESEA formulas that authorized public school programs in which parochial students were entitled to take part defused the church-state controversy, at least for a time. It may be significant to any future

debate that President Nixon has repeatedly made clear his hope to see non-public schools receive some form of Federal assistance.

During the 1964 debate, opponents of ESEA argued that Federal control of schools would inevitably follow Federal aid. President Nixon has also raised echoes of that debate with his proposal to share Federal revenues with state and local governments. Although the use of Federal tax dollars to support education is now widely accepted, the new dispute centers on who will decide how the Federal money will be spent. This issue pits the advocates of general, or unrestricted, aid against those of categorical assistance, aid pinpointed on pressing national problems in education which are not being met effectively by state or local education authorities.

Nearly all existing Federal programs are directed to specific educational trouble spots — modernizing teacher training, expanding school libraries, strengthening state education agencies and, most significantly in this context, relieving to some extent the financial burdens of disadvantaged urban school districts. But the President, many state governors, chief state school officers, school superintendents, mayors and Congressmen are now calling instead for unrestricted aid in the form of grants that state and local school officials can use as they see fit. In this way, the argument goes, the dangers of Federal control will be minimized and the severe financial squeeze of state and local governments reduced.

Others argue that if the limited amount of Federal money available for education is not to be wasted or made redundant, it should be directed specifically toward the worst problems, such as the decay of urban school systems. I believe that the experiment with Federal aid to date demonstrates that Federal control has not followed Federal aid. On the contrary, these Federal programs have, if anything, expanded the resources, effectiveness and options of local and state school agencies. Moreover, the advocates of revenue sharing for education must respond to some legitimate concerns. For example, many state education agencies are not yet capable of assuming major administrative responsibilities. Nor have state governments traditionally been responsive to the overwhelming needs of urban schools, especially in the largest metropolitan areas. And finally, as shown by the June 28, 1971, Supreme Court decisions *(Lemon* v. *Kurtzman* and *Earley* v. *DiCenso)* affecting state aid to parochial schools in Pennsylvania and Rhode Island, state constitutional prohibitions against using state funds for parochial schools could, under a state-controlled revenue-sharing program, raise anew the specter of the issue of aid to parochial schools.

I am not, however, unsympathetic to all forms of general aid. Given the rising cost of education and the limited tax resources of state and local governments, it may become necessary in the near future for the Federal government to underwrite a substantial share of the cost of the nation's schools. But if such general aid does come, it should be in addition to, not in place of, categorical programs that are directed toward problems of nationwide scope and particular urgency.

And then, seventeen years after *Brown* v. *Board of Education of Topeka,* there is still the problem of race. At this writing, the House Education and Labor Committee has just approved President Nixon's bill to provide $1.5 billion to

help school districts meet the costs of the desegregation process. But the committee rejected Mr. Nixon's amendment to ban the use of Federal funds for bussing. The ranking Republican on the committee, Rep. Albert H. Quie of Minnesota, said, in breaking with the President to help defeat the amendment, "It is ridiculous for the Federal government and the courts to require school districts to desegregate and then refuse to help them pay for their bussing costs."

The fate of the antibussing proviso on the House floor has not yet been decided. Nor, of course, speaking more generally, has the role of the Federal government been clearly determined on the issue of helping the nation's schools, both North and South, overcome what the Supreme Court has continuously held must be overcome — segregation.

State-Wide Financing

State governments are already deeply involved in the financing of public elementary and secondary education. In fact, they contribute approximately 42 per cent of the total costs of such education. State educational aid programs are generally of two kinds: flat grants distributed in the same amount on a per-pupil basis and equalizing grants designed to offset glaring disparities among districts in educational costs.

Why, then, are state-wide financing schemes advanced as a means of equalizing educational opportunity and upgrading urban education? The answer is that current state-aid programs have patently failed to provide as much aid proportionally to urban areas as they do to suburban and rural communities. A recent study by the National Educational Finance Project at the University of Florida concluded that in 14 states the richest districts received at least twice as much revenue per pupil as the poorest, while in 42 states the ratio of richest to poorest was at least one and a half.

One problem with current state-aid programs is that their formulas often have built-in requirements that all districts receive some aid regardless of their relative wealth. In addition, some formulas have conditions which prevent the poorest districts from receiving more than certain minimal levels and insure that no district will receive less than it did the previous year.

The property tax is, of course, central to discussions of state-wide financing. The variations in the tax base from district to district tend to perpetuate existing inequities.

Thus, in *Private Wealth and Public Education*, authors John E. Coons, William H. Clune III and Stephen D. Sugarman propose that the states take over the financing of education and distribute their revenues to districts or families on the basis of the tax rate they are willing to pay in support of education. This proposal is based on the following assumption: "The quality of public education may not be a function of wealth other than the wealth of the state as a whole." Unfortunately, the authors are long on theory and short on politics. The property tax persists in the face of almost universal criticism because it is convenient and cannot run away as can the sources of sales and income taxes. The distribution formulas persist because they reflect, to a considerable extent,

the power relationships within state legislatures and in the society generally.

In Michigan, for example, Governor William Milliken has proposed a virtual end of the local property tax as the revenue source for public schools in his state. A higher personal income tax and a value-added tax on manufactured goods would raise the $1.1 billion that would be relinquished in property taxes and would provide more money for schools as the economy of the state grows. The proposal, if accepted by the legislature and the public, would mean that the state would: (1) provide all the money for public school operations—it now supplies about 40 per cent—and (2) create a formula to end disparity in the distribution of school money. Spending in Michigan school districts ranges from $500 to more than $1,200 a year per pupil. Milliken noted that the state's assessed property valuation is "much too high and helps to cause taxpayer resistance."

Although this proposal sounds exceedingly rational, its prospects for becoming law are shaky. For a variety of reasons, the majority of the state legislators are against it. The Democratic leaders have countered with a proposal of their own and have proposed to change the state's constitutional prohibition against the graduated income tax. Local chapters of the Michigan Education Association fear a reduction in their bargaining power if salary negotiations become highly centralized at the state level. The state's powerful labor leaders have mixed emotions, with some fearing that the proposed shift will ultimately benefit the more rural upstate areas. Business is also split, with the service industries being generally against the proposal and the automobile industry favoring it. Civil rights groups remain wary but have announced that they are not, in principle, opposed to the proposal. The Milliken plan is therefore a good example of what on the surface appears a reasonable alternative to the present admittedly inequitable system of financing public education but an alternative which, on closer examination, is politically not—or in any event, not yet—tenable.

Adding to this complexity and unpredictability is the role of the courts in our system of government. For example, on August 30, 1971, the California Supreme Court, in *Serrano* v. *Priest*, struck down as unconstitutional that state's entire system of financing public schools, concluding that its effect is to provide more money for rich children than for poor. The ruling is binding in California only, but if it stands up, its revolutionary implication will be felt massively across the country. The court decision invalidating the present system probably will result in state-wide collection of property taxes at equal rates and roughly equal expenditures for each pupil. What decades of legislative politics could not achieve might well come about through a court case.

At this point, politics again enters the equation, for only the state legislature can decide whether the effect of the California decision will be to raise or lower total school spending in an effort to equalize spending for all. In the event the state comes to hold more of the purse strings, the legislature will also need to decide how much control over schools should pass from local districts to the state government. Such a decision could also alter the power of organized teachers' groups by making it necessary for them to negotiate salary scales on a state-wide basis rather than deal with local school districts, where they can more effectively pit one district against another.

79-836 O - 72 - 7

Although proposals to encourage state-wide financing of education have recently been given a substantial stimulus by the California decision, another approach to reform, the proposed experiment in educational vouchers, is encountering strong opposition.

Vouchers

In 1955, University of Chicago economist Milton Friedman published an article entitled, "The Role of Government in Education," which appeared in the book, *Economics in the Public Interest.* Friedman's article started consideration of the concept of educational vouchers—a means of placing the power of the competitive market in the hands of education consumers rather than its dispensers. The voucher idea has since been expanded by Christopher Jencks of the Center for the Study of Public Policy at Harvard and others.

The Nixon Administration has endorsed an experiment, designed by the Office of Economic Opportunity, to provide vouchers to parents of poor children which parents could give to the school to which they choose to send their children. The purpose of the experiment is to determine whether competition among schools, both public and private, can lead to better education for poor children.

Opposition to the voucher experiment has been strong. Leading the fight are the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers. They contend that public schools are already inadequately financed and that the voucher plan would mean sharing public school funds with private schools, thereby undermining the public school system. The antivoucher groups also claim it is unconstitutional to support religious schools with public tax dollars. The AFL-CIO executive council describes the voucher scheme as "one of the most bizarre proposals yet to emanate from within the Nixon Administration." In a resolution adopted in July, 1970, the NAACP said that "despite general assurances that the plan would include safeguards to prevent its use to further segregation, we deeply fear that this indeed would be the result."

Antivoucher lobbying has focused on the bill now before Congress to extend the life of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and Nixon Administration officials have accused the antivoucher forces of being so intent on killing the voucher experiment that they are willing to scuttle the entire OEO bill.

My own view of the voucher experiment is that, as an experiment, it is worth trying; if it can be demonstrated that a voucher plan can be of significant help in raising the quality of education in one community, then consideration should be given to applying it elsewhere; if the experiment shows no measurable improvement, it should not be expanded.

Surely, however, the problems of urban education are at once so difficult and so urgent that reasoned efforts to demonstrate alternative approaches ought not to be rejected out of hand. An open "show me" attitude of mind is therefore the most appropriate posture toward the voucher experiment.

Comprehensive Child Development

As I write, the House of Representatives has just approved a bill which has profound implications for improving the effectiveness of America's urban schools. The Comprehensive Child Development Bill—of which Representatives Patsy Mink (D-Hawaii), Ogden R. Reid (R-N.Y.) and I are cosponsors in the House and Senators Walter F. Mondale (D-Minn.) and Jacob K. Javits (R-N.Y.) are cosponsors in the Senate—has also been passed there. President Nixon should therefore soon have an opportunity to make good on his February 1969 Economic Opportunity Message to Congress. The President said then: "So critical is the matter of early growth that we must make a national commitment to providing all American children an opportunity for healthful and stimulating development during the first five years of life."

The Child Development Bill, a Congressional initiative, would provide day care, health and nutritional services, education and a wide variety of other services for children of all economic backgrounds—not just for children of the poor, as Head Start does. The new measure opens participation in child development programs to children of all backgrounds—poor, working poor, middle-income, wealthy—with a sliding scale of fees geared to family income above a certain level.

The sponsors of the measure have taken seriously the finding of the 1966 Coleman Report that children from economically poor families develop much more rapidly when they mix with children from homes of higher socioeconomic status—it broadens their horizons beyond what the late Oscar Lewis called the "culture of poverty."

Witness after witness during the many days of hearings conducted by the House Select Education Subcommittee during 1969-70-71 confirmed the benefits children might gain from the kind of comprehensive development services this bill would provide.

Indee[illegible]ndamental justification for the legislation is that the emotional security, sti[illegible]environment, good food and health care which it would help provide all co[illegible] to the development of a child's intelligence, creativity and interest in the wo[illegible]. For we have come more and more to understand that intelligence is protean and evolving.

Yet there is another argument, with compelling significance for urban education, for child development and day care services. While there are today over 8 million young children of working women, licensed day care facilities can accommodate only 641,000 children, a fraction of the 4.9 million children of working parents. Still more compelling perhaps is this statistic: in the next decade, the number of preschool children of working mothers will grow by over 40 per cent, while the demand for development services for other children will also surely increase.

By building a nationwide child development program open to children of all income groups and encouraging a socioeconomic mix, we shall not only be providing more effective and rewarding services for children. We shall, hopefully, achieve two other related purposes as well.

First, we can make some contribution toward coping with one of the most difficult problems in our cities—a problem on which Dr. Edward F. Zigler, Director of the Office of Child Development, commented to our subcommittee on August 27, 1970:

"We can't continue programs that send poor kids one place and rich kids another. That's what is causing polarization in our society today.

"We've got to find a way to bring the society back together and one of the places to do it is with children in programs like this."

Second, of course, the authors of the Comprehensive Child Development Bill hope that by enabling children from middle-income and well-off families—not just the children of the poor—to participate in the programs, a broader-based constituency for these programs will be built and will insist on adequate funding of them.

Although the Child Development Bill is no panacea for the ills of urban schools, it nevertheless seems fair to assert that children who experience the range of benefits the new program provides will, hopefully, be healthier, brighter more secure pupils when they go on to school. In my view, the Child Development Bill can mean the most significant advance for children in decades.

The National Institute of Education

Another measure now making its way through Congress that promises solid improvements for the nation's urban schools as well as for other aspects of our educational system is the National Institute of Education.

In his March 3, 1970, message to Congress on educational reform, President Nixon called for the establishment of such an institute as a "focus for educational research and experimentation in the United States. Declaring that "American education is in urgent need of repair" and that "we are not getting as much as we should out of the dollars we spend" on education, the President called for "a searching re-examination of our entire approach to learning."

With my Republican colleague, Congressman Reid of New York, I introduced, in both the last and this Congress, a bill authorizing the creation of the National Institute; my Select Education Subcommittee this year conducted several days of hearings and made field trips to educational research centers both in the United States and abroad; and in September, 1971, the Committee on Education and Labor favorably and unanimously reported the bill. Hopefully, it will become law within the coming months.

Why the need for a National Institute of Education?

As Charles Silberman said in *Crisis in the Classroom*: "The degree of ignorance about the process of education is far greater than I had thought. Research results are far more meager and contradictory, and progress toward the development of viable theories of learning and instruction is far slower."

Why should his reasonable hopes be so dashed? Part of the answer seems to me to be clear: we have not been serious about research in education. We have had enough research to annoy teachers in their classrooms, but not enough to make change in their working day. We have had enough research to whet the appetite

of concerned parents reading the lay press, yet not enough to make substantial difference in the schools to which they send their children.

A look at a few statistics shows how we have merely toyed with educational research and development in the United States.

No one quarrels with the proposition that planned innovation is essential if we are not to jeopardize our national security. We spend fully 10 per cent of our defense budget on research and development. Moreover, a solid quarter of this money is invested in basic, abstract academic work related to no particular policy or weapons system.

In health, where we know that the products of the laboratory save lives and halt pain, fully 4.6 per cent of all expenditures are earmarked for research and the creation of new developments.

But when we come to education—as important to the life of the mind as is defense to the nation or health to the body—we find all levels of education in this country spending less than one-third of one per cent of their budgets on the process of research, innovation and planned renewal.

The dinosaurs, we know, were consigned to the evolutionary scrap heap because their nervous systems were a negligible fraction of their tonnage. They could not detect, nor could they ponder, the changes that occurred around them and hence they could not adapt. Yet large creatures—be they animals or systems—are doomed when they cannot adapt to change.

Education, a $65-70-billion-a-year conglomerate of American social systems, should be aware of the ominous analogy. For if research and development are the nervous system of large-scale enterprises, one-third of one per cent of total cash spent is awfully little to be spending on one's nervous system. Without greater capacity to effect change than this pitiful amount represents, American education—and especially education in urban America—is in danger of becoming a dinosaur among social systems.

A National Institute of Education would support research and development at every level of education, preschool through postgraduate school, both in formal institutions of learning and outside them. Clearly among the principal items on the agenda of the Institute must be several that bear directly on our understanding of the problems of urban education and that make possible programs of research, development and demonstration addressed to the kinds of problems discussed in this paper.

Here are some examples of what the NIE staff and the institutions it supports might undertake. We need basic research into the learning process. We need special attention to crucial national concerns such as the education of the disadvantaged. We need to study educational finance at every level, including a wide variety of alternative means of paying for education, such as the voucher plan and performance contracting. We need to develop measures for assessing and evaluating the effectiveness of education and the shaping of techniques for helping schools apply such measures intelligently. We need to consider how to improve the education of educators, and we must advance educational practice in terms of both the content of what is taught and the means by which it is taught.

Because it is essential that education consumers—teachers, students, ad-

ministrators—be able to make effective use of new approaches emerging from the research and development effort, the NIE must have authority to disseminate the results of research and development. The bill approved by the House Committee provides that authority to the Institute.

Those of us in Congress who have been writing the legislation creating the Institute have also been careful to stipulate that it not be subject to the control of the U. S. Office of Education or of the Commissioner of Education. The history of research and development supported by the Office of Education has not been a happy one. It is not necessary here to rehearse the reasons that separating the education and research effort from its present location within OE is essential if major gains are to be made. The proponents of the Institute are determined that it be an agency with high visibility and institutional strength and have therefore provided that the NIE be headed by a Director of the same level as the Commissioner of Education, to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

In his March, 1970, message, President Nixon astutely observed that "We must stop pretending that we understand the mystery of the learning process, or that we are significantly applying science and technology to the techniques of teaching . . ."

In like fashion, surely we must stop pretending—if anyone really does—that we understand all the problems of education in America's cities or what to do about them. A National Institute of Education, of the kind here described, committed to excellence and eschewing mediocrity and focused on the most difficult dilemmas facing our schools, can mean hope instead of despair for those who teach and learn in the urban areas of the land.

Summary

In this review of urban education, I have attempted to give one Congressman's perception of the kinds of problems that beset the schools of our cities.

I have said something of Federal efforts to help solve the problems and I have outlined the political dimensions not only of a broadened Federal role in urban education but also the politics of other approaches, including both statewide financing and the voucher plan.

And finally, I have indicated how such new ventures as comprehensive child development services open to all children and a National Institute of Education dedicated to research of high quality can make substantial contributions to dealing with the crisis of urban education.

As a cautious optimist, I conclude my review by voicing agreement with the words of another one, John W. Gardner:

> I am convinced that twenty years from now we'll look back at our school system today and ask ourselves how we could have tolerated anything as primitive as education today. I think the pieces of an educational revolution are lying around unassembled, and I think we're going to put them together in the next few years.

Quality Education: A View from the Top[1]

CASSELL A. LAWSON AND CARROLL W. TAGESON
Department of Graduate Studies in Education
The University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana

Quality education is a very broad, and therefore very elusive, term. Measurement criteria, based primarily on survey information concerning school district adaptability, achievement testing, and school holding power versus number of dropouts, were developed in the 1960's by the Institute of Administrative Research, Teachers College, Columbia University.[2] Institute researchers have correlated an extensive number of variables, ranging from expenditures per pupil, to community environment, class size, deployment of professional staff and classroom variables to those criterion measurements with highly significant results. Combinations of these groups of factors have resulted in multiple correlations that range as high as .80, accounting for approximately two-thirds of the variance between good and poor schools, as measured by one or another of the criteria cited.[3]

The present article attempts to extend this investigation in another direction by presenting the results of a pilot study on how Indiana public school administrators view the concept of quality education and rate a list of components derived from these and other earlier studies. Our interest is in a more phenomenological or attitudinal approach to the notion of quality education, with a view towards determining existing mind-sets among administrators, parents, teachers, students and community leaders, bringing these into the open, and furthering the process of dialogue between all parties involved in the educational enterprise.

Our major concern in this venture is, quite frankly, the promotion of quality integrated education in the nation's urban schools. In another article currently being prepared for publication we argue for the viewpoint that, however it is defined and measured, quality education can never be achieved in segregated schools, whether such segregation be de jure or de facto. Following an analysis of urban education in America today, we conclude that if urban schools are ever to break through the vicious circle of poor teachers, poor facilities, inadequate revenue, poor curriculum, and a plethora of other problems, the entire system of urban education must be revamped. We must not just deal with isolated components of quality education; we must dismantle and rebuild the system entirely

[1] This study was made possible, in part, by a grant from the Social Science Training and Research Laboratory, University of Notre Dame. The authors wish to express their appreciation to Marlyn Ritchie and his staff.

[2] Cf. *Institute of Administrative Research Bulletin*, Teachers College, Columbia University, *passim*, from October, 1960.

[3] William S. Vincent, "Quality Control: A Rationale for Analysis of a School System," *Institute of Administrative Research Bulletin*, vol. 1, no. 2 (January, 1961), p. 1.

to eradicate the flaws that prohibit all students from being able to develop their optimum potential.

The Achievement Criterion

Most urban schools today, for example, are residentially segregated. One criterion used by educators and parents alike to determine quality education is performance on standardized achievement tests. Kenneth Clark has presented convincing evidence that the inferior school environment produced by residential segregation can bring about a systematic decline not only in achievement but in measured intelligence as well. His data were derived from studies of black children in the Harlem section of New York City. Clark asserts that the quality of education in most ghetto schools in the urban community is inferior, and that, in fact, the school environment is often one of low academic standards that provides a second-class education for disadvantaged youngsters.

Large class size, substandard staff and facilities, and low morale of teachers and the administrative staff are all common ingredients of the ghetto school. Clark found that the further these Harlem students advanced in school, the higher the proportion of "retarded" among them, and the greater the discrepancy between their achievement scores and the scores of other children in the city. This is especially tragic since one would expect school dropouts and force-outs to result in a weeding-out process affecting the poorer students and thereby decreasing rather than increasing the proportion of retarded children.

Some of Clark's findings are the following:

> In reading comprehension, 30 percent of the Harlem third grade pupils are reading below grade level compared to 21.6 percent who are reading above. For sixth grade pupils, the story is even more dismal. There 80.9 percent score below, indicating a rather rapid relative deterioration in reading comprehension within three school years.
>
> Between grades three and six, word knowledge falters also; in third grade, 38.9 percent score below grade level; 18.7 percent score above. In sixth grade, 77.5 percent are below; 10.6 percent above. Arithmetic shows a similar pattern of underachievement, though figures are only available for the sixth grade; 57.6 percent are below grade level in "computation"; 66.6 percent below in "problems and concepts." By eighth grade, three-quarters of the Harlem Junior High School students score below grade level in reading comprehension and word knowledge; in arithmetic, their performance is even more discouraging; 83.8 percent are now below.
>
> During those same grades, the pupils in Harlem slip further and further behind the achievement levels of both the city and the nation . . .
>
> In I.Q. the picture is just as alarming; a sharp drop for ghetto children between third and sixth grades, with only a slight improvement by the eighth grade, but still behind where they were in the third grade.
>
> Although the ghetto's pupil shows a decrease in mean I.Q. scores from the third to the sixth grade and a slight recovery by the eighth, New York City

> pupils as a whole show a slight but steady increase in I.Q.; until the eighth grade, they match the national norms.
>
> These findings strongly suggest that for Harlem pupils, I.Q. tests reflect the quality of teaching and the results in educational achievement more than intellectual potential. . . . Those who fail are shunted into classes for "children with mentally retarded development" and "opportunity" classes. Little is expected of them; they are rewarded for mediocre performance; and, consequently, accomplish increasingly less than pupils at their grade level should accomplish.
>
> . . . The schools are presently damaging the children they exist to help.[4]

We would argue that standardized testing can be a valuable instrument for determining quality education when used to measure a student's growth and development in the urban school. But, at present, a vicious circle has been joined. Achievement testing reflects what the child is taught in the classroom. It should therefore be preceded by a periodic review of the quality of teaching that is offered to the child. Where this is not done, and it seldom is, standardized testing is detrimental to the black child. Poorly taught, he scores low on standardized tests. His low scores then become the basis for placing him in special education classes, classes for the educationally handicapped.

Information given by the San Francisco Unified School District in reports dated March 26, 1970, and April 17, 1971, indicate that black children comprise approximately 27.8 percent of the total student population. Yet, black children comprise 47.4 percent of all students in EH classes, and 53.8 percent of all students in EMH classes.[5] This kind of imbalance is typical of the majority of urban school systems across the country. This is a most serious urban educational problem, because there is no valid scientific evidence that black children differ in innate intellectual ability from children of any other racial or ethnic group.

In all fairness, a moratorium should be called on ability and intelligence testing of black and other minority children until better and more reliable evaluative techniques are developed, or at least until educational quality is assured in the schools which they attend. The Association of Black Psychologists, in an attempt to have the present system overhauled, fully supports those parents who have chosen to defend their rights by refusing to allow their children and themselves to be subjected to achievement, intelligence, aptitude, and performance tests that have been and are being used to: (a) label black people as uneducable; (b) place black children in "special" classes and schools; (c) perpetuate inferior education for blacks; (d) assign black children to educational tracks; (e) deny black students higher educational opportunities; and (f) destroy positive growth and development of black people.[6]

---

[4] Kenneth B. Clark, *Dark Ghetto* (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), pp. 184-185.

[5] Presentation to San Francisco Unified School Districts School Board, May 5, 1970, by members of the Association of Black Psychologists, p. 2.

[6] R. L. Williams, Report to the APA Council of Representatives.

The Need for Integration

In light of all this, we agree with the authors of *Integrating the Desegregated School:* "School integration will not solve all of the social problems rampant in our nation, but it is one of the primary requisites for America's realization of a just and egalitarian society. Black and brown parents who support and fight for desegregation and integration believe that their children receive inferior instructional services in segregated schools. White parents who fight for desegregation believe that their segregated children receive an unrealistic and harmful view of American society. The stigma of segregation corrodes the perspectives, expectations, and, in many cases, achievements of minority youngsters. But majority students, too, are disadvantaged by their segregated school experience. Prepared for an unreal version of our society, they only accumulate, rather than confront, racial shibboleths."[7]

As these authors also point out, however, it is not enough merely to integrate. Integration of our schools must be carefully planned and implemented in order to ensure the maintenance of high standards of quality for all students. And for this to occur, it seems axiomatic that all interested parties—administrators, legislators, school boards, teachers, parents, students and the larger community itself—be in basic agreement as to the goals they wish to see achieved by the educational process, and the means required to attain these goals. Where no conscious consensus exists on such basic issues, various segments of the educational community may well end up working at cross purposes.

Recent Shifts in Emphasis

It is interesting, in this context, to contrast the arguments of a few years back about school dropouts and force-outs with current arguments concerning the failure of ghetto education. In essence, both arguments were pointed at the same phenomenon—the failure of urban education.

Urban parents had a legitimate reason to be disenchanted, for the ghetto child was being shortchanged in the development of reading skills and other aspects of quality education defined as grade-level achievement. A few years ago, the desires and aspirations of black parents might have been satisfied with equality of performance. But today, deprivation has acquired other dimensions, and, in the process, the definition of quality education is taking on a new emphasis. The dominant theme now emerging lies in the affective domain—the development of human beings with a sense of self-worth and the ability to live affirmatively and humanely with their fellow men. To the planners and policy-makers of the Sputnik era, such goals represented the "left-wing" of education. They evoked unpleasant overtones of the progressive school of education and were regarded as irrelevant, if not downright inimical, to cognitive learning, the mastery of skills,

---

[7] Mark Chesler, Carl Jorgensen, and Phyllis Erenberg, *Planning Educational Change: Vol. III, Integrating the Desegregated School* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969), Preface, pp. iii-iv.

the stockpiling of information; in short, to quality education as it was then defined.

But the events of the last decade are bringing the affective aspects of education out of exile. On the one hand, proponents of the vast compensatory programs designed to redress the educational imbalance between the rich and the poor—programs aimed squarely at raising grade-level achievement—continue to maintain that compensatory education has not had a fair chance. They believe that with more funds for more programs, quality education could be brought to the disadvantaged. However, it must be pointed out that ghetto parents (and indeed a growing number of educators) no longer subscribe to this argument. They have seen educational budgets and educators' salaries increase and class sizes shrink without comparable improvement in their children's achievement. They are unwilling to continue writing blank checks for programs aimed solely at rehabilitating the casualties to fit the present educational system. They are calling for change in the system itself.[8]

Determining Attitudes Towards Quality Education

The authors of the present article are frankly partial to the definition of quality education given by J. E. Allen, Jr., while Assistant Secretary and Commissioner of Education:

> The charge and the challenge to education in our democratic society is the maximum realization of the potential of every individual. The ultimate prevention of the school dropout and consequent conservation of human resources is quality education which takes into account the unique needs and characteristics of the individual student. The dropout prevention program under Title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is designed to promote change and improvement in education toward this goal. In carrying out this program, we must continue and strengthen our efforts to identify the capabilities of each student, and through wise guidance help him to make the most of his possibilities. An important aspect of guidance service which should be provided to all students is assistance in arriving at an appropriate occupational and career choice.
>
> The human development enterprise, which is the business of education, calls for emphasis on personal and social as well as intellectual learning. The guidance and personnel services function in education may appropriately assume a major role in that learning which deals with the development of acceptable values, a positive self-concept, and levels of aspiration commensurate with interests and abilities.
>
> An educational experience that takes such things into consideration and that preserves each student's individuality, his right of self-determination, and his right to be respected, is the most effective assurance of dropout prevention, and may well contribute to the prevention of other causes which interfere with the full development of all human beings.[9]

[8] Henry M. Lewin, *Community Control of Schools* (The Brooking Institute, Washington, D.C.), p. 55.

[9] J. E. Allen, Jr., cited in W. S. Kruger, "They Don't Have to Drop Out," *American Education*, vol. 5 (October, 1969), pp. 6-8.

We realize, however, that this description, authoritative though it may sound, may not be shared equally by all segments of the educational community. In order to pin down and operationalize what people do in fact understand by the term quality education, we designed and administered a questionnaire to 300 school administrators in the State of Indiana. Our study investigated their views on three definitions and ten possible components of quality education. The definitions and components were arrived at by consulting the literature and various experts in the field of education.[10]

The 300 superintendents and principals represent five major school corporations throughout Indiana, and were chosen for their availability for this pilot study, and because four of the five had school segregation cases filed against them in the early 1960's. The sample thus included the superintendents and principals of the public school corporations of South Bend, Elkhart, Kokomo, Indianapolis, and Gary.

Procedure:

After the determination of corporations had been made, the senior author personally visited each school superintendent to discuss the questionnaire and its purpose. Of the total population of 300 administrators, 216 returned their questionnaires, and the data from these were analyzed by computer.

Timing:

The study was conducted during the month of December, 1970, and the month of January, 1971. All data were collected by January 15, 1971.

Questions:

1. Will a majority of administrators concur on one of the three definitions of quality education?
2. To which of the ten components of quality education will they give highest priorities?
3. Will there be any major disagreements on priorities among the five regions studied?
4. Will there be any major disagreements on priorities between administrators of predominantly black schools as opposed to administrators of predominantly white schools?

The Questionnaire:

The questionnaire, omitting background information, is divided into two parts. The first part consists of three possible definitions of quality education. Respondents were asked to indicate, with respect to each definition:

1. if you strongly agree
2. if you agree somewhat

[10] Cf. Robert A. Bower, *A Dozen Signs of Quality Education* (Pennsylvania Education Publication, Pennsylvania Department of Education, Sept.-Oct., 1970), pp. 6-8.

3. if you disagree somewhat
4. if you strongly disagree

A fifth option was given to those who disagreed with any of the three definitions, with the request that they define quality education in their own terms.

Definitions of Quality Education

The three definitions (which, in our own thinking we designated as traditional, achievement-oriented, and humanistic, though we did not so label them in the questionnaire), were given as follows:

A. *Quality education* prepares the student to become a productive citizen in the democratic society in which he lives.
B. *Quality education* leads to a level of academic achievement comparable to that of his peers in society.
C. *Quality education* allows each student to develop his own individual talents at his own rate, and at his own level.

Results:

Table I breaks down the individual response to the three definitions for each region studied.

Table II presents the mean and median ranking of each definition by all the administrators. The frequency column records how many administrators "strongly agree" with each definition.

Table I
Breakdown of How Each Region Responded to Definitions of Quality Education

	South Bend N = 34					Elkhart N = 23					Kokomo N = 13					Indianapolis N = 107					Gary N = 39				
	1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
A	17	14	2			14	9				7	6				61	42	3	0		27	10	1		
B	8	15	7	3		6	10	3	3	1	6	6	1			32	39	34	1	1	17	15	3	3	
C	16	14	3			15	7	0	1		6	6	1			57	46	3	0	1	24	10	4	1	

Table II
Mean Ranks of Total Program (N = 216)

	Mean	*Median*	*Standard Deviation*	*Mode*	*Frequency*
A	1.4	1.3	.62	1	126
B	2.0	1.9	.92	2	69
C	1.5	1.4	.69	1	118

Interpretation:

Results indicate that more administrators agree with definitions A and C (the traditional and humanistic definitions, respectively) than with definition B (the competitive achievement definition). Three respondents agreed with none of the proffered definitions, and provided their own. The data seem to reflect the fact that Indiana administrators are sensitive to recent criticism of the public school system as being too achievement-oriented in the post-Sputnik era, and perceive themselves as favoring either the traditional society-oriented model of good citizenship or the more recent pupil-centered, humanistic model, such as that proposed by Allen. (When the ratings "strongly agree" and "agree somewhat" are summed, 207 administrators favored definition A, 154 definition B, and 195 definition C.) It would seem more accurate to say that this sample favors both A and C together, and does not perceive them to be antagonistic.

Components of Quality Education

Part II of the questionnaire deals with ten possible components of quality education. Instructions were as follows:

> II. A list of variables for quality education appears below. These components need to be included in various ways in order to facilitate quality education.
>
> From 1 to 10 on the basis of how you value and feel personally about their importance to you, rank these ten components of quality education. For example, if you personally feel that facilities are most important to you in this hierarchy, then assign that item number 1.

RANK

..... A. *School Board*—the importance of the policy-making board to the implementation of the establishment and implementation of stated goals.
..... B. *Number of Students* that enter college from that school.
..... C. *Teachers*—an experienced, well-qualified, stable person employed to instruct students.
..... D. *Curriculum*—a systematic group of courses that facilitate effective learning, interaction, and flexibility.
..... E. *Pupil Personnel Services*—services provided by a member or members of the school staff concerned with adjustment, and personal development of the student to the society at large.
..... F. *School Administration*—the direction and management of those aspects of school administration most directly related to the instructional process.
..... G. *Physical Facilities*—school plant, furnishings, audiovisual aids, textbooks and library books.
..... H. *Stated Philosophy*—a statement of educational goals or objectives which in some way relate to pupils, personnel, curriculum, instructional process and other related services.

..... I. *Revenue*—the relationship of money spent per pupil to the implementation of stated educational goals.

..... J. *Environment*—the interaction of school environment with home and social environment.

The identity of the respondent will be kept confidential.

Results:

Table III represents the data obtained from all 216 respondents. Component rankings for all 216 administrators are based on mean ranks, since no differences were found using the median.

TABLE III

THE RANK ORDER FOR THE TEN COMPONENTS, BASED ON THE MEAN RANK (N = 216)

Component	*Mean*	*Median*	*Standard Deviation*	*Component Rankings*
1. School Board	5.6	5.8	2.8	1. Teachers
2. Number of Students	9.7	9.9	1.4	2. Curriculum
3. Teachers	1.8	1.3	1.4	3. School Administration
4. Curriculum	3.7	3.3	1.9	4. Stated Philosophy
5. Pupil Personnel Services	6.5	6.8	2.1	5. Environment
6. School Administration	4.1	3.8	2.0	6. School Board
7. Physical Facilities	5.7	6.0	2.3	7. Physical Facilities
8. Stated Philosophy	5.3	5.2	2.8	8. Revenue
9. Revenue	5.8	6.0	2.4	9. Pupil Personnel Services
10. Environment	5.4	5.5	2.7	10. Number of Students

Interpretation:

The data do seem to indicate that these Indiana administrators are highly pupil-centered in their approach and intentions. The fact that they almost universally rate "number of students that enter college" lowest in their ranking of the ten components of quality education would seem to imply that their interest lies in the development of their students here and now, without reference to their future potential for post high school education. The emphasis on quality teaching as the highest ranked component of quality education is also heartening.

The three top-ranked components (teaching, curriculum and school administration) seem, however, to reflect a more traditional emphasis on academic matters as the chief concern of these administrators. While pupil-centered, they do seem most concerned about the intellectual or scholastic development of the children who attend their schools (if this, indeed, is what is reflected by these favored components). The extremely low ranking given to pupil personnel services, which ideally should enhance the affective and social development of the child, tends to bear out this assumption.[11]

[11] Cf. Bernard H. McKenna, "Patterns of Staff Deployment Related to School Quality," *Institute of Administrative Research Bulletin*, vol. 1, no. 3 (April, 1961). The author states: "It is noteworthy that the professional positions having to do with psychological services, health, and guidance should also be strongly related to the quality criterion" (p. 4). Correlations were .40, .37, and .30, respectively.

The humanistic model of quality education stresses the development of the whole child, social and emotional as well as academic and intellectual, while the citizenship model emphasizes the social responsibility of the schools in preparing students to enter our democratic society well prepared to carry out its varied tasks. Our sample definitely favored these definitions or a combination of them; yet, in ranking the components, still gives most emphasis to the development of cognitive and technical skills.

The comparatively low ranking given to revenue also strikes us as a bit unrealistic.[12] Perhaps this explains why pupil personnel services and other components having to do with the social and emotional development of students are ranked so low. To upgrade such functions costs a school corporation more money than is usually available. Health care, preventive mental hygiene, adequate counseling services, are generally considered luxury items in all but the most affluent school districts, and are usually the first to be cut when revenues dip.

And yet quality education, at least as Allen and others define it, is a costly affair. It would be interesting in this context to see how other interested parties—parents, teachers, students and community leaders—would rank these various components. Further research needs to be done before priorities can be firmly set and agreed upon. Once this is done, the entire community can then narrow its sights and work together to fulfill its common definition of quality education.

TABLE IV
HOW EACH INDIVIDUAL REGION RANKS COMPONENTS

	REGIONS				
	34	*13*	*23*	*107*	*39*
School Board	7	3	7	7	5
Number of Students	10	10	10	10	10
Teachers	1	1	1	1	1
Curriculum	2	4	3	2	2
Pupil Personnel Services	9	9	9	8	8
School Administration	3	2	2	3	4
Physical Facilities	4	8	8	6	9
Stated Philosophy	8	5	4	5	3
Revenue	9	7	6	9	7
Environment	5	6	5	4	6

34 — South Bend
13 — Kokomo
23 — Elkhart
107 — Indianapolis
39 — Gary

[12] Cf. William S. Vincent, "Quality Control: A Rationale for Analysis of a School System," *Institute of Administrative Research Bulletin*, vol. 1, no. 2 (January, 1961). The author states (p. 4): "Expenditure level has proved to bear the most consistently high relationship to school quality of any single measure that has yet been identified."

TABLE V
INTERCORRELATION OF MEAN RANKING OF COMPONENTS OF QUALITY EDUCATION BY FIVE INDIAINA REGIONS

	REGIONS				
	1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
1					
2	.78				
3	.79	.78			
4	.76	.79	.89		
5	.65	.89	.92	.86	

1 — South Bend
2 — Elkhart
3 — Kokomo
4 — Indianapolis
5 — Gary

In general there is significant agreement among regions in ranking components. A lower, but still significant, correlation is found between Gary and South Bend.

We found only minor disagreement among administrators from the five different corporations in the mean ranking given to each of the ten components. Table IV indicates the mean rank given to each of the components by the five corporations involved in this study.

Table V shows the intercorrelations of mean rankings between the five regions. Except for Gary and South Bend, agreement is quite high among the administrators of these regions. Examination of the data indicates that Gary ranked "stated philosophy" considerably higher than any other school corporation. This was true particularly of the predominantly black schools in Gary, indicating, perhaps, a transition taking place in that city's school system. The importance attributed to a stated philosophy of educational goals may be the first indication of further changes in priorities to be expected in that region.

To determine whether there was any major difference in ranking of components between administrators of predominantly black schools and predominantly white ones (defined as having a population of black students higher than 50 percent, or vice versa), we examined data from the Indianapolis school corporation. This corporation was the largest (107 administrators, almost half the sample), and, alone among the districts, had given us the necessary background information.

Agreement between these administrators was remarkably high. A rank-order correlation of .97 was found between the mean rankings of components by both groups.

CONCLUSION

This article has attempted to investigate some of the aspects of the concept of quality education. Our pilot study in the State of Indiana attempted to further the process of operationalizing both the definition of quality education and its

components. We have seen how Indiana administrators, primarily public school principals, see the priorities involved. We need now to refine our investigative tools and extend the study to other parties deeply involved in the educational process: teachers, students, parents, school boards, and other community leaders. Our hope is that, by uncovering areas of basic agreement and disagreement, a consensus on priorities can be reached, and communities can begin to work harmoniously towards the solution of the many problems that face our nation's schools today.

The problem of achieving adequate education in our public schools is, however, primarily a moral problem; a problem of our purpose and aspirations as a nation and a people. The real reason why we have thus far neglected to service our public school children as well as we should is not lack of economic capabilities or of financial resources, but rather lack of moral resolve. And this is doubly damaging, because meeting the needs within our public schools does not even pose the hard choice of helping some at the expense of others. Meeting these needs fully would help all, because the highest values of the Republic and all it stands for are to be found in the development of the young people who are our greatest national asset.

What is required to achieve quality education is a commitment to work toward the achievement of a racially integrated society. Individuals must become more sensitive to their own behavior and attitudes which facilitate or obstruct movement toward this goal, to the end that the facilitative behaviors are increased and the obstructive ones eliminated. We must strive for the realization of pluralism rather than assimilation as the essential characteristic of a truly integrated society. To assimilate or amalgamate, and thus eclipse the unique characteristics of the many groups which make up our society, is just as destructive as to segregate or eliminate from social interaction the minority contribution. In a pluralistic society, there are a respected position and role for all.

It has become increasingly clear that in the North and West desegregation is not enough.[13] The Princeton Plan, rezoning, or careful location of new school buildings can often affect a fairly stable school situation, seriously violating the neighborhood school concept or incurring expensive transportation of students. And in the large core city, no easy solution is yet in sight. The constant increase in minority group population along with the flight of middle-class whites to the suburbs or across school district lines, makes the small community approach difficult to apply.

"Other things being equal," wrote DuBois in 1935, "the mixed school is the broader, more natural basis for the education of all youth. It gives wider contact; it inspires greater self-confidence and suppresses the inferiority complex." Today we might say more simply that, in the integrated school, children develop a healthier self-concept.

But integration is not enough. *Quality* integration education is imperative, if urban education is to survive and flourish. This is the twofold challenge facing our urban schools. At this stage in history, urban education cannot afford to accept the status quo.

[13] Hubert H. Humphrey, *School Desegregation: Documents and Commentaries* (New York: Cromwell Co., 1964), p. 3.

Six Prerequisites to Successful Teaching in Inner-city Communities

CALVERT HAYES SMITH
Associate Professor and Head, Department of Urban Affairs, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio

Urban educators have too often worked on the assumption that "programs" hold the key to successful educational development of inner-city youngsters. My experiences, however, indicate that there are other variables which undoubtedly influence the level of achievement. The basic assumption of this writer is that the significant variables in these situations are the adjustments of teachers who serve as the vehicles through which the program must be transmitted to the students. My position is that unless teachers are fundamentally sound in terms of their orientation toward the inner city and unless they have certain attitudes, the program cannot achieve its objectives.

To this end, I suggest that there are six prerequisites to successful teaching in any inner-city community and that these prerequisites must be the foundation upon which the educational philosophy of the personnel in the school is based if programs introduced into inner-city schools are to have any impact on the educational development of the students.

WHO IS TO BLAME?

First of all, if teachers are to be successful in the inner city, we must realize that the failures we are experiencing there are not attributable to the dynamics existing in the community and its surrounding environmental forces, but to our inability to analyze those dynamics and, subsequently, to utilize them in classroom situations.

Generally speaking, we avoid shouldering the responsibility for our failures; rather, we assume that the causes for such failures result from some genetic intellectual inferiority of the students or to some social pathology existing in the environment in which inner-city youngsters live. Far too many teachers apparently believe that inner-city youngsters lack the native intellectual ability to function effectively in school. This conclusion is based on observations of what teachers actually do in inner-city schools rather than on what they say they do. As Jacoby indicates:

> . . . one of the gravest problems of all faced by school systems with large concentrations of inner-city students . . . is a deeply ingrained belief . . . that such children have less ability to learn than other children. . . . The attitude that large numbers of children are uneducable gives teachers an

> easy out if they work where most of their students score in the bottom fifth of the nation on standardized reading tests.[1]

Whereas a large percentage of inner-city school teachers believe that their students are intellectually inferior to other students, a far larger number ascribe the failures of education in these situations to some kind of social pathology existing in the life style of their students and their parents. These teachers function on the assumption that there is something pathologically wrong with the children's environment and ultimately with their culture. Further, they tend to believe that the experiences evolving from a different life style are innately bad and negative.

This belief is evident by the terms we use to describe youngsters from oppressed situations, e.g., "culturally deprived," "culturally disadvantaged," etc. In many instances, educators are beginning to demonstrate some perception in this area for such terms are being replaced by others; however, the attitudinal and behavioral changes which must accompany the change in terminology have not developed, for the approaches which teachers continue to use in inner-city schools are both culturally arrogant and culturally biased.

The results of research indicate that the relative strengths and weaknesses in different attributes remain constant for various ethnic groups which experience unique circumstances influencing their life style. Jews, for example, score higher, relative to the general population, in verbal ability than they do in space conceptualization. For Chinese children, the relative strengths and weaknesses in verbal ability and space conceptualization are reversed. Similarly, blacks seem to perform somewhat better in arithmetic skills and space conceptualization than they do in verbal tests; for Puerto Ricans, the pattern is almost the reverse. Although middle-class children score higher in all categories, the relative ethnic differences are not entirely eliminated. To Lesser and Stodolsky these findings suggest new distinctions, definitions and a new course of action. To the concept of equality of educational opportunity, they want to add what they consider an equally important objective of diversification, of trading on the strengths of different ethnic groups to help them develop those strengths to the maximum. They conclude:

> Beyond deploying all necessary resources to achieve minimal equality in essential goals, further development of students may well be diverse. Following our principle of matching instruction and ability, we incidentally may enhance the initial strengths which each group possesses.[2]

There is no suggestion here to produce a black or a Puerto Rican curriculum; what they do propose is tailoring the mode and techniques of instruction to the strengths of particular children. The school must take the life styles of the various ethnic groups in the inner city seriously as a condition and a pattern of experiences—not just as a contemptible and humiliating set of circumstances

[1] Susan L. Jacoby, "National Monument to Failure," *Saturday Review* (November, 1967), p. 89.

[2] Susan S. Stodolsky and Gerald Lesser, "Learning Patterns in the Disadvantaged," *Harvard Educational Review* (Fall, 1967).

from which the children should be anxious to escape. It must accept their language, their dress and their values as a point of departure for disciplined exploration. They must be understood, not as a trick for enticing them into the white middle-class culture, but as a way of helping them to explore the meaning of their own lives. This is the way to nurture potentialities from whatever ethnic group or social class. This is the first prerequisite.

Teachers in the inner city, then, must accept the fact that the failures of many inner-city children are actually due to the inability of the school and staff to be responsive to the experiences and cultural strengths of the youngsters as they presently exist. If we intend to be successful in this setting, teachers must go through cognitive and affective learning processes which will enable them to identify the cultural strengths in the life styles of their students so that they can alter programs and approaches to reflect the children's cultural orientation and capitalize on their strengths.

Expanding the Function of Inner-city Schools

The second prerequisite to successful teaching in the inner city is an expansion of the function of the school. Since America has become an industrialized society, the main purpose of urban, as well as of other schools, has been to serve a managerial function.[3] That is to say that the major function of the school has been to prepare youngsters to serve productive roles in society. Since one of the major criteria for productiveness is the degree to which one is able to procure and maintain employment, then the major function of the school has been to prepare youngsters for jobs. There is nothing wrong with the school's having as one of its functions the preparation of youngsters for the world of work. It is a legitimate goal. But, when we observe that most black, Spanish-speaking and Indian youngsters served by the schools are not prepared to function productively in society, we must conclude that there is a problem somewhere. When we realize that the percentages of "minority group" youngsters composing the unemployment rolls far outnumber their percent of the total population, and that fewer than half the youngsters in inner-city communities entering high school actually graduate, we are forced to conclude that there must be an alternative approach from that presently operative.

Because unemployment and dropout rates among "minority groups" have become alarmingly high, schools have raised a number of questions; however, few if any of these questions have been concerned with whether or not inner-city schools should give traditional or managerial functions top priority to offset this trend.

I suggest that the schools serving the inner city must recognize and respect the traditional values of their students and give traditional functions top priority.[4] That is to say, that the school must serve the collective memory of the community with which it is working. It must assume as its major function the develop-

[3] The use of the concepts managerial and traditional as school functions was adopted from Thomas F. Green, "Schools and Communities," *Harvard Educational Review* (Spring, 1969), pp. 221-252.

[4] *Ibid.*

ment of high self-esteem in youngsters through self-identity. Research results have shown that it is only after a person begins to value his link with a group, a link which he cannot sever under any circumstances, only after he realizes that he is important because the group into which he was born is important, that he begins to value himself or that he develops high self-esteem. It is an established fact that high self-esteem is the major success factor in any situation.[5]

The school then, through teachers, must support and encourage cultural values, for it is only after these traditional functions have been served adequately that one can expect to serve managerial functions effectively. If teachers expect to be successful in the inner city, the second adjustment which they must make is to expand the function of the school to include emphasis on the cultural values and heritage of students. If managerial functions are given priority over traditional functions, then it matters not how many programs we introduce into the setting; they will continue to fail.

Teacher Expectations and Student Achievement

The third prerequisite to successful teaching in the inner city involves the relationship between teacher expectations and student performances. All teachers, regardless of where they teach, must constantly evaluate the relationship between the rewards they issue and the behavior for which such rewards are given. This evaluation, however, is especially significant for teachers in the inner city.

Historically, disenfranchised groups of people in America, especially black people, have been informed directly and indirectly that success for them will come if they are obedient, humble, respectful, and exhibit good behavior. Such assumptions so permeate our society and the institutions responsible for preparing teachers that many teachers in the inner city function there not realizing the basis for their behavior. The impact of these prevailing assumptions is operative at all levels of the educational system.

In Washington, D.C., for example, almost every black male in high school must participate in a "cadet corps" whose first objective is to inculcate habits of orderliness and precision, to instill discipline and, thereby, respect for constituted authority. As Gittell and Hevesi note:

> It is no accident that in high schools (in Washington) with large white enrollments, the voluntary nature of the cadet program is explained to students and (only) one-quarter or fewer of the students join—while five of the predominately black high schools have 100 percent enrollments.[6]

In most instances in inner-city schools, the prevailing emphasis is on conformity rather than creativity, on discipline rather than on independence, and on quiet orderliness rather than on the joy of discovery. I suggest that teachers in the inner city must determine whether they reward youngsters who conform,

---

[5] Floyd Miller, "What Every Child Needs Most," *Reader's Digest* (January, 1969), pp. 149-152.

[6] Marilyn Gittell and Alan G. Hevesi, *The Politics of Urban Education*. New York: Praeger, 1969, p. 252.

are obedient and respectful or those who perform. For as Rosenthal and Jacobson imply, the behavior a teacher rewards is the behavior she expects.[7]

One need only observe a classroom situation for a period of time to realize that the vast majority of those youngsters who are disobedient, disrespectful nonconformists in terms of the rules established in the classroom (rules which restrict the normal behavior of children having the imagination to be disruptive enough to be annoying but not enough to be excluded from the classroom) are the ones who usually have the creativity to perform. Because, however we reward conformity and good behavior, those youngsters whose creativity will not permit them to be harnessed by the rules established in the classroom are labelled as problems. When we label them as such, we respond to them as though they were problems and as though we expected them to be problems; consequently, what we expect, we find.

I am suggesting, then, that the third prerequisite for successful teaching in inner-city classrooms is for teachers to *expect* achievement from their youngsters; to look for ability, responsibility, initiative and creativity and to reward it. Teachers must search for performance and they must accept nothing less than such in working with their students. Teachers in urban classrooms must function on the assumption that children deserve to be treated with as much dignity and respect as other humans.

Holt points out how respect operates by indicating that it means treating children as if their ideas made some difference. He concludes ". . . when we treat people this way, whatever their age, color, or background, we find that communication barriers disappear and that learning takes place."[8]

The Role of the Teacher in the Inner-city Community

The fourth prerequisite to successful teaching in the inner city is an understanding of the teachers' role in a given school and in a given community and a willingness to accept such. Teachers in the inner city must understand and accept the fact that they are servants of the community. They are working with that community's most valuable commodity, its children; therefore, community people have a *right* to question the teachers' performance and activities and the teacher has an *obligation* to respond.

Ironically, but significantly, many inner-city teachers object verbally and/or behaviorally, to being defined as servants of the inner-city community, whereas other teachers do not object to such categorization in white, middle-class communities. The reasoning is apparently based on the assumption that citizens of middle-class communities are "educated" whereas teachers in the inner city look upon their population by and large as "uneducated." The designation, "educated" or "uneducated," is usually based on the number of years spent in formal educational institutions. When this attitude develops among teachers, they confuse their role and begin to dictate and try to control the lives of the people

[7] Robert Rosenthal and Lenore Jacobson, *Pygmalion in the Classroom.* Chicago: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.

[8] John Holt, *The Underachieving School.* New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation, 1967, p. 103.

in the community through the ideas they espouse and what they teach in educational institutions where they are supposed to serve rather than dictate.

What really happens in this situation is that teachers become professional colonialists functioning under the guise of professional educators. The people in this situation are the recipients of another layer of colonialism imposed by "educators" in addition to the one that is already being imposed by society in general. Preston Wilcox summarizes this situation when he states:

> The caste system favoring professionals in the ghetto has so effectively intervened that the key decisions are often made by professionals rather than the families they have come to serve.[9]

In defining the teacher's role in the community as one in which he is a servant to that community, I intend to imply that teachers must realize the prerogatives the community has and accept its right to exercise such. They must realize that the local community in which they work must be allowed and encouraged to participate in the establishment of policy for the school. The local community should agree to the thrust of the total educational program before various aspects of it are initiated in the schools. It must participate in establishing the criteria for the hiring and firing of school personnel. That is to say, then, that the community must be accepted as the legitimate evaluators of the teachers' performance.

In suggesting an evaluative function for people within the community, it must be stressed that a parent does not have to complete 16 or more years in formal educational institutions to determine whether or not the school is performing adequately. He merely has to observe his child's educational progress to make such a decision. Parents can discuss the day's events with their children and readily know that the teacher has or has not done an effective job.

The important distinction to be made in this situation is that parents in evaluative roles are concerned with products, whereas teachers or professional educators functioning in such roles are concerned with process. In reference to this situation, Samuels notes:

> When the evaluation of the teacher is determined by student achievement, teachers are left relatively free to use methods of their own choice which work, that is, which produce the desired learning outcomes. When the evaluation of the teacher is based upon process criteria, that is, how subject matter is presented and how closely the teacher follows approved teaching methods, the teacher must focus on means rather than on the goal of student achievement and cannot realistically be held responsible for learning outcomes.[10]

In operationalizing the teachers' servant role in the inner-city community, I am suggesting that teachers must be held responsible for student achievement and that the role of the community in evaluation can be legitimately based on desired learning outcomes.

---

[9] Preston Wilcox, "The Community-Centered School," in *The Schoolhouse in the City*, Alvin Toffler (ed.). New York: Praeger Publishers, 1968, p. 105.

[10] Joanna Jenny Samuels, "Impingements on Teacher Autonomy," *Urban Education*, Vol. V., No. 2 (July, 1970), pp. 165-166.

In suggesting a role in evaluation for parents, we are *not* attempting to limit the teachers' range of involvement in decision-making. In fact, we are attempting to increase such. For, as Simon indicates, when methods are specified and outside evaluation focuses on methods rather than outcomes, teachers have little opportunity to exercise discretion.[11] On the other hand, when methods are left to the discretion of teachers and results are reviewed and evaluated, more opportunity for autonomous decisions is available.[12]

Parents in the inner city are not interested in how professionals serving them accomplish their tasks, they merely want their children educated. If a teacher does not facilitate this process, if he does not do the job the community he serves wants done, he has no business functioning in that community at all. Teachers must accept the fact that they are serving at the pleasure of a given community and not at that community's expense—as is presently the case in many inner-city situations.

Attitudes Toward Responsibilities

The fifth prerequisite to successful teaching in inner-city classrooms relates to the teachers' attitude toward professional responsibilities. The loyalties of teachers must be to the students and parents for whom they work and the profession in which they work, but not to the system or to their personal careers. Far too often in urban educational situations, the teachers' orientation tends to be upward to administrative superiors rather than across to the local community clients. Teachers must make decisions which are educationally sound for the youngsters with whom they work, irrespective of whether or not such decisions coincide with the demands of the system.

One of my responsibilities over the last few years has been to work with teachers who are already employed in the inner city. One of the most interesting phenomena I have experienced in these situations is the extensive complaining these individuals have done or do about situations existing in their school settings which handicap their endeavors. Inevitably, someone in the group will allude to one of four major problems:

(1) the biases of standardized achievement tests;
(2) the irrelevancy of textbooks;
(3) the incompetence of school administrators; and
(4) the illogicalness of present systems developed to evaluate the process of teaching.

When these problems, as well as others, are identified, I remind the group that success in their endeavors will only come when they assume definite positions in terms of each one of these problems and when they are willing to push for the necessary changes in light of their stand.

If teachers in the inner city feel that standardized achievement tests are

[11] H. A. Simon, "Decision-making and Administrative Organization," *Public Administration Review* (Winter, 1944), p. 28.
[12] P. M. Blau, *Bureaucracy in Modern Society*. New York: Random House, 1956.

ineffective in evaluating the progress, strengths and weaknesses of their students, they must decide that those tests must be discontinued and they must refuse to administer them. They must, however, be able to suggest other ways of accomplishing what the tests attempt but fail to do.

If teachers feel that the textbooks provided for their classes are oriented to a style of life completely foreign to that experienced by their students, they must assume the position that such textbooks can no longer be used in their classrooms. They must illustrate the irrelevancy of such materials and work for the development and utilization of materials which capitalize on the cultural strengths of their youngsters; consequently increasing the possibilities of success.

If teachers feel that the function of an administrator is to facilitate their professional growth and to provide an educational atmosphere in which they can be productive, but they work where prescribed activities restrict their behavior, as is too often the case, then the teachers in the school must join forces with the community to see to it that such administrators are relieved of their responsibilities at the earliest possible date and/or search for other administrative organizational patterns to accomplish their purposes.

If teachers feel that the evaluation of educational processes in the various classrooms should be the responsibility of their teaching colleagues rather than that of an administrator who seldom, if ever, is in a position to observe that process in action, then they must be willing to take affirmative actions in light of such beliefs by suggesting alternatives facilitating the restructuring of present teacher evaluation procedures.

All this is a way of saying that teachers must become professionally oriented rather than career-oriented. For they can only be successful in their endeavors in the inner city when it is clearly understood by parents and students that teachers are committed to providing the best educational opportunities possible for the youngsters.

Insuring Success in the Classroom

Jonathan Kozol in *Death at an Early Age: The Destruction of the Hearts and Minds of Negro Children in the Boston Public Schools* retells many interesting accounts of his experiences as a teacher in a predominantly black school in Boston, but that portion of the book dealing with the ways in which the school guaranteed the failure of black children remains uppermost in my mind. There are stories about the things he was not permitted to do with or for black children; in many instances, things which other teachers were allowed to do for white children in the same school. For instance, he notes that the reading teacher invited one white child and his parents to visit her, helped another to go to summer camp, and gave one expensive books; however, when Kozol gave a black child a ride home or took another to the museum or visited one's home, he was reprimanded.

More important, each time he was able to motivate his youngsters and interest them in some particular activity, he was made to stop. Once he was forbidden to give children supplementary material he had prepared for social

studies which clearly related the invention of the cotton gin to slavery. On another occasion, he was told to stop using a book about the first black in a certain town to enter an all-white school, in spite of the fact that the children were reading it enthusiastically. He was criticized for giving the children writings in which they described the world as they saw it and about which they wrote expressively and well.

He wasn't permitted to display some paintings although the children found them interesting. And he was ultimately fired for reading a poem by Langston Hughes, "The Landlord," which many children enjoyed and understood from experiences.[13]

Although the events in many inner-city schools may differ from those experienced by Kozol, the hard fact is that with few exceptions such schools have fallen back on the strategy of deliberate failure. It appears as though they have a vested interest in that failure and that they apparently do not mean to succeed.

If teachers are to be successful in inner-city school situations, they must destroy the failure syndrome existing there and institute methods and procedures which will insure the success of all youngsters in the classroom. Teachers in such situations must realize that all youngsters have strengths and, consequently, will achieve if methods and materials used in classroom situations will facilitate the development of such strengths. Teachers must develop attitudes which force them to feel directly responsible for the failure of any youngsters to experience some personal, social and intellectual growth while they are in their classes.

Urban schools have unique ways of shifting the responsibility for the many failures existing there from their own shoulders to someone else's. High school teachers claim their youngsters were not provided with a sound foundation in elementary school. Teachers in the upper elementary grades blame the lower-grade teachers for failing to teach youngsters the basic skills, and lower-grade teachers claim the youngsters were not prepared for school when they enrolled, and they pass the blame on to the home. If schools in our urban areas are to serve youngsters in some meaningful fashion, the rationalization of failures existing there must be eliminated and each teacher must dedicate himself to seeing to it that youngsters achieve.

Teachers may accomplish this goal in many different ways and what will work for one person will not necessarily work for another. There is one approach, however, which I feel has considerable merit. I offer it here merely as the foundation upon which one can build to facilitate the educational development of all youngsters in the classroom. If, however, this approach, which includes six steps, is utilized faithfully, the classroom will be relieved of the dullness it presently is endowed with and transformed into a productive, lively and enjoyable place for both teachers and students.

Step I

Announce to everyone at the beginning of the school year or semester that

[13] Jonathan Kozol, *Death at an Early Age: The Destruction of the Hearts and Minds of Negro Children in the Boston Public Schools.* New York: Houghton-Mifflin, 1968.

no one will fail and *mean it*. Indicate to the children that everyone will pass. Remind them that they have been promoted to the present grade because they successfully accomplished the necessary tasks in the previous grade; consequently, they have come to you for the purpose of learning what there is to learn in this grade and that everyone will achieve that goal.

This step attempts to give the youngsters positive attitudes toward their activities during the year by releasing their anxiety over the possibility of failure. Many youngsters in the inner city refuse to participate because whenever they had become involved with the school on previous occasions they failed. This step, then, seeks to open the door of the classroom to all the youngsters—intellectually as well as physically.

Step II

Permit the class to organize into cooperative groups. Encourage youngsters to decide with whom they would like to work. Do not limit the number of groups or the number of persons in each group. The composition of the groups may change during the year at the discretion of the youngsters.

The purpose of this organization is to eliminate intergroup competition and encourage intragroup cooperation. In suggesting such arrangement, we are attempting to do a number of things such as:

(a) capitalize on the socializing tendency among children;
(b) utilize the peer-group pressure to conform to group norms which exist among all youngsters;
(c) capitalize on the desire of youngsters to be accepted by other youngsters;
(d) encourage individual and total group cooperation as the group realizes that it is responsible to itself; and
(e) utilize the competitive group spirit so extremely evident at school athletic contests or other such events.

Step III

Establish performance criteria (goals) at the beginning of each marking period for each subject matter area for each group. This is done cooperatively between the teacher and each group individually, meaning that each group may have different criteria for each subject.

This step insures that everyone will decide beforehand precisely what is to be accomplished over the course of the marking period. The teacher must work closely with the groups at this point to see to it that the criteria are specific and precise, for the procedure will not be effective if the criteria are vague. The teacher and the group should prepare a list of specific *behaviors* to be acquired by the group by the end of a given period of time. These goals or performance criteria should be subject to change or revision as the group proceeds with its activities, but at least the group should know where it is going at all times.

This step attempts to eliminate much of the confusion and frustration existing in urban classrooms because students, and in some instances teachers, have little or no idea about where the classroom activities will lead.

Step IV

Prepare a survey in the subject matter areas in which the group will be working. This survey should revolve around the performance criteria established by each group. The purpose of the survey is to determine what the groups already know about the areas of interest they have identified. Based on the results of this survey, the groups can determine what they must do to accomplish their goals and how they must go about gathering additional information.

The survey is to be used for feedback. It is not to be used as the basis upon which grades are issued. It is to provide youngsters with information relative to what they must do to accomplish their objectives.

Step V

At the end of selected periods of time during the marking period, resurvey selected group members again for feedback purposes. Each time this is done, the teacher is merely attempting to determine the extent to which the youngsters have accomplished their goals—performing according to the criteria they have set for themselves at the beginning of the period.

This procedure, resurveying youngsters, will provide evaluative information for group members. The selected group members should be encouraged to work out cooperatively the answers to the survey if they desire. Cooperation in this situation replaces competition. Everyone in the group is working toward achieving a minimal level of performance. The group can use the results of the survey in structuring their activities for the remainder of the marking period. Using the results of the survey, they will be able to determine how they should allocate their time to accomplish their purposes.

Step VI

When the teacher and the group are satisfied that the group has reached the minimal performance criteria level, the group should be encouraged to select another related area of interest and begin the process anew.

It should be noted that, under this method, the role of the teacher is three dimensional: coordinator, organizer and resource person. The most important dimension of the role is that of resource person. In this role, he provides resources which youngsters can use to accomplish their goals. This resource role involves a variety of activities ranging from providing materials in the classroom for students' use to arranging field trips for a given group. Irrespective of the specific activity in which the group is involved, the resource role should permit the teacher to have contact with more youngsters in a relationship where they are the primary actors. The degree of student involvement and the extent to which the teacher becomes a resource to all students are two characteristics distinguishing this approach from the typical classroom procedure.

Teachers who consider using this approach must be flexible in terms of group composition and in establishing performance criteria. The success of the

approach depends upon the extent to which the teacher is able to comfortably fulfill the resource role and is perceptive in assessing the activities of the groups and the significance of group activity which does not always appear to be task-oriented.

In summary, I suggest that teachers who expect to be successful in the inner city must make six basic adjustments. They must:

(1) accept the fact that the school is failing to adjust to the expressed needs and cultural orientations of inner-city youngsters;
(2) expand the function of the school so that traditional values of students receive top priority in all aspects of the school's program;
(3) emphasize creativity, performance, responsibility and initiative rather than conformity and order;
(4) understand the nature of their servants' role in the community and accept such;
(5) become professionally oriented rather than career-oriented; and
(6) structure classroom activities in such a way that students' success will be insured.

When these six adjustments have been made, it can be predicted that the degree of success experienced by inner-city school teachers will be greatly increased.

The Effect of Practice Teaching in Inner-city Schools on Attitudes Toward Teaching in Inner-city Schools

MURRAY LEVINE AND M. GEORGE FEENEY[1]
State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, New York

That there is widespread criticism of the adequacy of education-methods courses as preparation for teaching in general, and for teaching in inner-city schools in particular, hardly needs to be documented (Koerner, 1963; Passow, 1963; Passow, Goldberg & Tannenbaum, 1967; Sarason *et al.*, 1962; Stone, 1968). The prescription that our teachers ought to have more liberal arts courses to prepare them better for teaching subject matter (Conant, 1963; Stone, 1968) fails to recognize that any kind of intellectual preparation removed from the actual classroom will prove inadequate in helping the teacher meet the psychological and social demands found there (Sarason *et al.*, 1962; 1966). Even the highly touted MAT programs (Stone, 1968) leave much to be desired in that respect (A. Levine, 1968; Sarason, in press). While the preprofessional courses may be of some help to teachers in learning how to organize a course and prepare a lesson, new teachers and student teachers are in agreement (Koerner, 1963) that the relatively few weeks of full-time practice teaching has provided their most valuable educational experience, which often is still insufficient, particularly in ghetto schools (Sarason *et al.*, 1966).

Complaints that some teachers in the inner city are strongly prejudiced (Clark, 1965), and the very rapid turnover rate of new teachers, reaching 50 percent in some city school systems, clearly reveal that contact alone is insufficient to ensure positive attitudes toward inner-city teaching. It follows that simply exposing student teachers to inner-city classrooms as part of their training will also be insufficient.

The present study derives from an initial attempt to modify the student teacher experience in inner-city schools to provide more contact with classrooms and more contact with children (Levine, Dunn and Donlan, 1965; Levine, *et al.*, 1968). We noted that our students who worked with first-grade children maintained favorable attitudes, compared with controls who were not in the special program. However, we also noted that our control group had a very high proportion of students who had taught older children.

We developed the hypothesis that the age of the child taught may well exercise an important effect on the student teacher's attitudes because older children are more difficult to control than younger ones. The purpose of the present study is to determine the effect of the grade taught on student teachers' attitudes toward teaching in inner-city schools.

[1] We wish to express our indebtedness to S. B. Sarason and his colleagues at the Yale Psycho-Educational Clinic where this work was initiated. I am also indebted to my wife, Adeline Levine, Assistant Professor of Sociology, SUNY, at Buffalo, for her critical reading of the manuscript and for her suggestions. Freda Dunn of the New Haven Public Schools, and Dr. Kay Donlan of Southern Connecticut State College were most cooperative in helping us to obtain the data, and we are pleased to acknowledge their assistance.

Method

The present study took advantage of a relatively unique field situation in order to develop data about variables influencing attitude change in student teachers following contact with an urban, predominantly black pupil population. Southern Connecticut State College had a long-standing contract with the New Haven school system to use four of its elementary schools as laboratory schools for its program of teacher education. The contract preexisted the black migration to northern cities. By the time this study was undertaken, between 50 and 70 percent of the population of these four schools was black. The cooperating teachers were, for the most part, experienced and capable individuals who had developed their own methods of coping with this situation. With the exception of modest in-service training programs, or courses they had taken, the cooperating teachers had themselves had no special preparation for the situation in which they were working. The city school system was just trying to introduce some changes in curriculum, in methods and in school organization; at the college, new content in education courses was just beginning to appear. Our own project (Levine *et al.*, 1965; 1968) was established on a pilot basis as part of the early effort to orient some portion of the education program toward teaching in inner-city schools.

The 157 teaching students who participated in the present study were all juniors, primarily female (88 percent), under 21 (92 percent), and almost all were white. The religious distribution followed the distribution for the New Haven area: 61 percent Catholic, 26 percent Protestant, 10 percent Jewish, and a few indicated no religious affiliation. Using Hollingshead's scale (Hollingshead and Redlich 1958) classes I and II contributed 14 percent; class III, 29 percent; and, classes IV and V, 57 percent.

At Southern Connecticut, at that time, almost all junior-year student teachers were assigned to these four inner-city schools. Students came for a nine-week full-time practice teaching experience. Their work in the classrooms was supervised by the cooperating teacher, and periodically they were observed by supervisors from the college. Students were not randomly assigned to grade level. A student had some choice about teaching at the upper primary or the lower primary level. There was no statistically significant relationship between social class background, age, or religion and grade taught. Males tended to be concentrated at the upper-grade levels, but men taught at all levels. The numbers were too small to permit detailed analysis of this variable, and we hesitated to reduce our numbers at each grade level by eliminating males. If there are complex interactions between sex, grade taught and attitude change, these analyses will not reveal them. Also, because of a variety of possible differences related to nonrandom assignment of students to grade level, the major analyses were carried out using a covariance method which takes into account the initial level of scores on the attitude scales.

The student taught at all levels from preschool through the sixth grade. Three groupings of approximately equal size were formed: preschool, kindergarten and first grade (N=44); second and third grade (N=56); and fourth, fifth and sixth grades (N=57).

A 34-item questionnaire designed to tap attitudes toward teaching in inner-city schools was administered during the first and last week of the student's nine-week practice teaching period. All of the students in the first two cycles of the year were involved. The questionnaire had been constructed for use with teachers (Levine *et al.*, 1968), but as yet we have little data concerning its psychometric properties. (Unpublished validity studies have shown the scales differentiate volunteers for an inner-city tutoring program from otherwise comparable non-volunteers. Also, experienced teachers participating in an NDEA summer institute on teaching in the inner city revealed more favorable attitudes than liberal arts college graduates with no inner-city experience taking an eight-week summer crash program in teaching.)

The questionnaires were administered in a group by a college supervisor well known to the students. Students were asked to identify themselves by using their mothers' maiden names. Their anonymity was preserved and we were able to match the pre- and postquestionnaires.

Two hundred questionnaires were administered in the two cycles of pretesting. We were left with 157 usable questionnaires at the end, the losses being due to absentees, and incomplete or incorrectly completed questionnaires which were unscorable.

Table 1

The following statements represent a sampling of observations and opinions about children, teaching conditions, problems and solutions to problems which have been expressed in various publications.

In these statements, the term inner city refers to schools or neighborhoods which are composed of Negro or Puerto Rican families and sometimes whites, who have low incomes, or who are welfare clients. Some refer to children from these families as culturally deprived or disadvantaged.

There are no correct answers to these problems but in view of your own experiences, reading, thinking and conversations with others, how do you feel about the issues that are stated?

If you strongly agree with the statement, you would write in "1."
If you agree with the statement, you would write in "2."
If you tend to agree with the statement, you would write in "3."
If you tend to disagree with the statement, you would write in "4."
If you disagree with the statement, you would write in "5."
If you strongly disagree with the statement, you would write in "6."

Please express your frank opinion or reaction to each statement.

Consider each statement separately.

Do not hesitate to express your opinions in strong terms, if that's the way you feel about the statement.

1. Children in inner-city schools will be slow learners no matter how they are taught. .....
2. The inner-city school is the best place to work because of all the educational experimentation which is taking place. .....
3. Parents of children in inner-city schools are really interested in how their children do at school. .....
4. Children in inner-city schools are beset with so many other problems that most cannot be expected to work well in school. .....
5. A teacher must *make* children in inner-city schools work or obey. .....

79-836 O -72 - 9

6. A teacher really has more chance to be creative and flexible in inner-city schools than in a suburban school. .....
7. The effort it takes to reach an inner-city child is too great for the return you get. .....
8. Children in schools in inner-city neighborhoods show great interest in learning. .....
9. Teachers can teach a great deal to inner-city children who don't have proper preparation for school at home. .....
10. Differences between children in inner-city schools and other schools in educational achievement can be accounted for almost entirely by heredity. .....
11. Teachers are no more than baby-sitters in most inner-city schools. .....
12. Children are exposed to so much violence and immorality in the neighborhood they do not come to school in a receptive frame of mind. .....
13. Parents of children in inner-city schools appreciate it when a teacher works unusually hard with a child. .....
14. Children in inner-city schools respect adult authority. .....
15. It is discouraging because the school is asked to do too much in educating children in the inner city. .....
16. The rewards of teaching a child in an inner-city school more than compensate for the frustrations. .....
17. If a teacher isn't right on top of an inner-city class every minute the children will get out of control. .....
18. It doesn't pay to work in an inner-city school because no one really cares for the children. .....
19. Children in inner-city schools are so poorly endowed intellectually that they should be given more arts and crafts and less academic work. .....
20. Most teachers who work in inner-city schools are good teachers. .....
21. Environmental factors are primarily responsible for the difficulties inner-city children experience in doing well in school. .....
22. Children in inner-city schools are very open and spontaneous. .....
23. Negro children will not do well in school as long as many Negroes are not in responsible teaching, supervisory and administrative positions. .....
24. A teacher cannot count on cooperation from the home when an inner-city school child is having a problem in class. .....
25. Children in inner-city schools care if they do well or not. .....
26. The frustration and strain of working in an inner-city school are more than I can take. .....
27. Most inner-city children are so affectionate it makes it worthwhile to work with them. .....
28. Parents of children in inner-city schools are likely to be against the teacher. .....
29. Children in inner-city schools are loud and raucous. .....
30. Because of all the problems, teachers cannot be expected to teach as much academic work to children in inner-city schools as in other parts of the city. .....
31. Children in inner-city schools are not very hard to control. .....
32. Inner-city school children would learn better if more of their teachers worked harder with them. .....
33. I would prefer working in an inner-city school to a suburban school, if I had my choice. .....
34. Teachers would do a much better job with the others if they would have more special classes for the disturbed and the slow learners in inner-city schools. .....

Results

The practice teaching experience has some general effects on attitudes of student teachers. Correlated *t* tests, which evaluated overall pre-post mean changes, reached significance ($p<.05$) in 12 of the 34 attitude scale items. Seven of these 12 items (5, 14, 17, 22, 29, 31 and 34) have to do with handling behavior problems, and with matters related to discipline and control. In each case the student teachers, irrespective of grade taught, agree that discipline and control are more difficult than they had previously suspected. This finding is very similar to that reported repeatedly with the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory. Teachers become *less* permissively oriented with increasing experiences in any school.

Three further items (12, 30 and 32) change in the direction of expressing more pessimism generally about the possibility of teaching in the face of the many social problems they see in and around the children. Item 32 changes in the direction of more disagreement with the proposition that children's failure is due to inadequate work by teachers with the children. The inference is that the cause of failure is elsewhere than with the teachers' efforts.

The remaining two items shift in a more positive direction. The student teachers see inner-city children as more affectionate after contact than before (item 27), and they disagree more with the proposition that inner-city parents are likely to be against the teacher, after experiences in the inner-city school (item 28).

The grade taught during practice teaching has a differential effect on student teacher attitudes. A covariance analysis (done on the postdata with the predata as covariate) provides statistical control of initial differences between the groups teaching in the various grades. Consequently, it permits direct evaluation of any differential effects that the teaching experience has on the attitudes of these groups. The analysis produced significant *F* ratios for grade taught effects on 14 of the 34 attitude scale items. The mean of these significant *F*'s can be seen in Table 2, which presents change in attitude scale items as a consequence of grade taught. In each of the 14 items, the direction or amount of change in attitude scale points, from prepractice teaching to postpractice teaching, is sharply different between the younger (Kg-1st) and older grades (4-5-6th grades).

TABLE 2
Changes in Attitude Scale Items as a Consequence of Grade Taught

Item No.	*Grade Taught*	*N*	*Mean Pre*	*± Change Score*
1.	Kg - 1st	44	4.7	—0.1
	2nd-3rd	56	4.8	—0.2
	4th-5th-6th	57	4.7	0.0
2.[a]	Kg - 1st	44	3.9	+0.2
	2nd-3rd	56	3.7	—0.3
	4th-5th-6th	57	4.2	—0.3
3.	Kg - 1st	44	4.1	+0.4
	2nd-3rd	56	4.1	+0.2
	4th-5th-6th	57	4.1	—0.2

TABLE 2 (continued)

Item No.	*Grade Taught*	*N*	*Mean Pre*	*± Change Score*
4.	Kg - 1st	44	3.8	+0.1
	2nd-3rd	56	3.4	—0.1
	4th-5th-6th	57	3.4	0.0
5.[c]	Kg - 1st	44	3.7	+0.6
	2nd-3rd	56	4.0	+0.7
	4th-5th-6th	57	3.9	+0.6
6.	Kg - 1st	44	4.1	+0.1
	2nd-3rd	56	3.9	0.0
	4th-5th-6th	57	3.9	—0.1
7.[a, d]	Kg - 1st	44	5.3	—0.1
	2nd-3rd	56	5.3	+0.1
	4th-5th-6th	56	5.4	+0.6
8.[d]	Kg - 1st	44	3.8	+0.4
	2nd-3rd	56	3.6	—0.4
	4th-5th-6th	57	4.1	—0.3
9.[c, d]	Kg - 1st	44	2.9	0.0
	2nd-3rd	56	3.1	—0.5
	4th-5th-6th	57	3.3	—0.6
10.	Kg - 1st	44	5.3	+0.1
	2nd-3rd	56	5.2	—0.0
	4th-5th-6th	57	5.1	+0.1
11.[d]	Kg - 1st	44	5.2	—0.1
	2nd-3rd	56	4.9	—0.2
	4th-5th-6th	57	5.1	+0.5
12.[c, d]	Kg - 1st	44	3.9	+0.2
	2nd-3rd	56	3.8	+0.2
	4th-5th-6th	57	3.6	+0.6
13.[d]	Kg - 1st	44	3.2	—0.1
	2nd-3rd	56	3.4	+0.1
	4th-5th-6th	57	3.4	+0.2
14.[c, d]	Kg - 1st	44	3.8	—0.2
	2nd-3rd	56	4.0	—0.4
	4th-5th-6th	57	4.0	—0.5
15.	Kg - 1st	44	4.5	+0.2
	2nd-3rd	56	4.2	+0.1
	4th-5th-6th	57	4.1	+0.2
16.	Kg - 1st	44	2.6	+0.2
	2nd-3rd	56	2.4	—0.2
	4th-5th-6th	57	2.8	0.0
17.[c]	Kg - 1st	44	3.8	+0.6
	2nd-3rd	56	3.4	+0.6
	4th-5th-6th	57	3.1	+0.7
18.	Kg - 1st	44	5.2	+0.1
	2nd-3rd	56	5.1	0.0
	4th-5th-6th	57	5.1	+0.3
19.	Kg - 1st	44	5.3	+0.4
	2nd-3rd	56	5.2	0.0
	4th-5th-6th	57	5.0	+0.2
20.	Kg - 1st	44	3.0	0.0
	2nd-3rd	56	2.9	0.0
	4th-5th-6th	57	3.1	0.0

TABLE 2 (continued)

Item No.	*Grade Taught*	*N*	*Mean Pre*	± *Change Score*
21.	Kg - 1st	44	2.0	—0.3
	2nd-3rd	56	2.1	—0.2
	4th-5th-6th	57	2.0	+0.1
22.[b]	Kg - 1st	44	3.1	+0.5
	2nd-3rd	56	3.3	+0.3
	4th-5th-6th	57	3.4	+0.4
23.	Kg - 1st	44	4.9	0.0
	2nd-3rd	56	4.8	0.0
	4th-5th-6th	57	4.6	—0.1
24.	Kg - 1st	44	3.4	—0.3
	2nd-3rd	56	3.6	—0.2
	4th-5th-6th	57	3.6	0.0
25.[d]	Kg - 1st	44	3.0	+0.5
	2nd-3rd	56	2.9	—0.1
	4th-5th-6th	57	3.2	—0.3
26.[d]	Kg - 1st	44	4.7	—0.4
	2nd-3rd	56	4.9	+0.3
	4th-5th-6th	57	4.4	+0.3
27.[c, d]	Kg - 1st	44	3.2	+0.7
	2nd-3rd	56	3.2	+0.4
	4th-5th-6th	57	3.5	+0.2
28.[c]	Kg - 1st	44	3.7	—0.5
	2nd-3rd	56	3.5	—0.8
	4th-5th-6th	57	3.7	—0.1
29.[c, d]	Kg - 1st	44	3.7	+0.5
	2nd-3rd	56	3.5	+0.3
	4th-5th-6th	57	3.6	+1.0
30.[a]	Kg - 1st	44	3.8	+0.3
	2nd-3rd	56	3.7	+0.3
	4th-5th-6th	57	3.5	+0.5
31.[c]	Kg - 1st	44	4.3	0.0
	2nd-3rd	56	4.0	—1.0
	4th-5th-6th	57	4.5	—0.4
32.[c, d]	Kg - 1st	44	3.2	—0.2
	2nd-3rd	56	3.3	—0.7
	4th-5th-6th	57	3.3	—0.6
33.[d]	Kg - 1st	44	3.5	+0.3
	2nd-3rd	56	3.9	—0.1
	4th-5th-6th	57	4.1	—0-1
34.[c]	Kg - 1st	44	2.3	+0.3
	2nd-3rd	56	2.6	+1.0
	4th-5th-6th	57	2.1	+0.5

[a]Overall mean difference pre-post significant at $p=.05$ or less
[b]Overall mean difference pre-post significant at $p=.01$ or less
[c]Overall mean difference pre-post significant at $p=.001$ or less
[d]Items significant for post practice teaching grade effects, at $p<.05$, holding constant pre-scores by covariance-analysis.
±Change Score=Pre Score—Post Score
positive change score means change in direction of *agreement with* statement

The items appear to fall into three categories.

Four of the items (2, 26, 32, and 33) seem related to viewing the inner-city school as a good place to work. On all of these items, those who taught in the lower grades tend to agree more that the city school is a good place to work after experience, while those who practice-taught in the upper grades disagree more than they did earlier with this general proposition.

Six of the items (7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 25) seem to deal with pessimistic feelings about children learning, or with the sense of professional competence and satisfaction in working in inner-city schools. All six of these items show the same trend. Those who taught children in the lower grades tend to retain, or increase, their sense of optimism, satisfaction and hopefulness about teaching the children, while those who taught upper-grade children tend to become more pessimistic than before their practice-teaching experience.

The remaining four items (14, 22, 29, 31) deal with matters of discipline and control. Although all student teachers tend to have problems in this area, it appears that those who teach in the upper grades have particular trouble.

While not found to be significant in the covariance analysis, items 3, 13, and 28 show this characteristic divergent direction of change for the different grades. These items have to do with feelings about the children's parents. Again, those who practice-taught in the lower grades continue to feel the parents are co-operative and interested, while those who taught in the upper grades seem to change more in the direction of disagreeing that parents are cooperative and interested.

The covariance analysis also included social class as a variable. Although there were few effects associated with social class per se, several statistically significant interactions with grade taught were found. These, however, showed no clear patterns.[2]

In an attempt to understand further the experience of the student teachers, pre-post change scores for every item were correlated with pre-post change scores for every other item.[3] Nearly half of the item change scores correlated significantly with change scores on one-third of the other items. Two items (14 and 31), having to do with the teacher's ability to control the children, showed the greatest number of correlates with other items, confirming that discipline and control are indeed salient issues for student teachers. Those who felt better about the children's respect for authority, or about the readiness with which the children respond to controls, also felt better about many other issues, and the converse was also true.

What is most interesting, however, is that none of the changes on the seven

[2] The general impression from the data was that student teachers who come from working class backgrounds (Hollingshead classes IV and V) appear to start out with less favorable views of inner-city schools and children, and after experience, at the lower-grade levels, seem to develop more favorable attitudes. Student teachers coming from middle- and upper middle-class backgrounds (Hollingshead classes I, II and III) tend to start out more favorably inclined, and seem to become more disillusioned particularly after practice teaching with younger children; less change is apparent after practice teaching with older children. The working class student teachers tend not to change their views after teaching older inner-city children.

[3] The correlation matrix of change scores is not presented because of its prohibitive size. The fact that none of its correlations were very high, militated against any attempt at a factor analysis.

items relating to control (5, 11, 12, 14, 24, 29, 31) correlated with changes on item 33 (I would prefer teaching in an inner-city school to a suburban school, if I had my choice), despite that fact that each of these control items showed significant correlations with at least 12 of the remaining 32 items.

Changes on item 33 showed correlations with changes on 13 other items. These 13 items seem to break down into three general categories. First, the school situation is viewed as professionally rewarding (2, 6, 20, 30). Secondly, the inner-city school situation is viewed as personally gratifying, or at least not too stressful (items 7, 13, 16, 18, 26). Finally, the children are viewed in a positive light (1, 8, 25, 27). Changes along these dimensions, of professional and personal reward, and views of the children as responsive relate to changes in the attitude toward teaching in the inner city. Changes in attitudes about the difficulty of maintaining discipline do not relate to changes in attitudes about teaching in inner-city schools.

Discussion

The nine weeks' practice-teaching experience had striking effects on the student teachers' attitudes toward inner-city schools. Moreover, the directions of these effects can be related to the usual training which the student receives to prepare him for the teaching role.

It is not surprising that, irrespective of grade taught, attitudes about discipline and control change as a result of the practice-teaching experience.

Clinical experience with new teachers, and with student teachers suggests very strongly that student teachers receive very little realistic preclinical preparation for what they will face, and the preparation they do receive does not really permit an examination or an understanding of the important changes in self which take place when the young student encounters teaching responsibilities. There are many unexpressed fantasies about how the student will do all those nice things for children that his teachers never did for him. There is no realistic preclinical preparation for the fact that the only model the teaching student has to fall back upon in moments of stress is the introjected image of past teachers. There is no realistic preparation, nor opportunity afterward to sort out the feelings when the student teacher finds himself responding in ways that are totally foreign to him and different from anything he ever expected he would experience. Students are not sure of themselves, their preparation is usually insufficient for the situation they encounter, and they suffer from not being able to assess their own values, or the children's need for structure and control, except as they are fortunate to work it out with a responsive master teacher (not all are), or by themselves (Sarason *et al.*, 1966; Levine, *et al.*, 1965; 1968).

Practice teaching in the lower grades tends to create more favorable attitudes toward teaching in inner-city schools, while teaching in the upper grades has the opposite effect. To understand this grade effect, one must consider both the different conditions across the grade levels and the factors influencing how teachers feel about these conditions. The correlational analysis of the results suggests that an important one of these factors is a feeling of professional accomplishment. A student teacher who feels he has fulfilled his role as a profes-

sional is likely to be satisfied with his teaching experience. One can infer that this is most likely to occur when classroom conditions are conducive to his idea of professional accomplishment. Consequently, the grade effect with respect to favorable attitudes toward teaching in inner-city schools can be related to how teachers are taught to perceive their role, as this affects what classroom conditions they will find satisfying.

Professional methods courses tend to define teaching as the proper preparation and presentation of subject matter for the child to absorb. Student teachers are taught in educational methods courses that: if they prepare their materials properly, then the children will learn. Being able to impart subject matter is central to the student teacher's view of the self as a competent professional person. One may or may not wish to argue with that definition, but it is clear that imparting subject matter means imparting it to a receptive child. If one does not have a child who appears receptive, then one cannot teach. If one cannot teach, there is no way of validating one's professional competence. A situation in which children are viewed as unreceptive cannot be professionally gratifying.

A second issue is somewhat more subtle. Teachers teach the curriculum and texts they are told to teach, by methods they are told are proper. It is our impression, based on observation and discussion, that innovation and experimentation in teaching approaches are not encouraged within most schools, nor does the situation permit much attempt at innovation, although many inner-city school situations cry for far-reaching changes. The teaching method is viewed as tried and true, and not be tampered with. Given this limitation, if the child is not receptive, there must be something wrong with him. If there is something wrong with him, then he'll never learn. If he'll never learn, there is no point in trying to teach him, particularly if he is older.

Student teachers in the lower grades find that the children are more receptive to learning than expected, while student teachers in the upper grades find the opposite. Receptive children are an important condition helping to produce the satisfaction which teachers of the younger grades experience. Receptive children enable the teacher both to validate himself as a professional and to feel that his efforts are worthwhile, as the children respond. Likewise, unreceptive children are an important reason for the dissatisfaction which teachers in the upper grades experience. Children who are seemingly unable or unwilling to learn give the teacher no opportunity to prove his ability in the teaching role. Also, such children, given the assumption that the fault lies in them and not in how they are taught, do not make the teacher feel his efforts are worthwhile.

It is our impression that much of the formation of the professional identity of the teacher takes place during teacher education, or during the first year of teaching, and that if the functions which are incorporated within that sense of identity are narrowly defined, then the teacher will work in narrowly defined ways, and find satisfaction in narrowly defined ways. If teaching is defined exclusively as the proper preparation and presentation of material, and the process of becoming a teacher does not permit any focus upon the emotional, and the irrational in the process of becoming, then we shall lose human capacity in our teachers. In small ways we have tried to intervene in the process through discussion groups with new teachers (Sarason *et al.*, 1966) and through modifying

the student teacher experience to include a prolonged experience with a child in a one-to-one tutoring relationship (Levine *et al.*, 1965, 1968). However, there is much more to be learned about how one can work to enlarge the capacity of teachers to understand and to appreciate themselves and their children and, at the same time, to develop our own understanding of the critical interaction between an individual and the social settings in which he lives his life.

References

Clark, K. B. *Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power.* New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

Conant, J. B. *The Education of American Teachers.* New York: McGraw Hill, 1963.

Hollingshead, A. B., & Redlich, F. C. *Social Class and Mental Illness.* New York: John Wiley, 1958.

Koerner, J. D. *The Miseducation of American Teachers.* Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963.

Levine, A. "Marital and Occupational Plans of Women in Professional Schools: Law, Medicine, Nursing, Teaching." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Sociology, Yale University, 1968.

Levine, M., Dunn, F., & Dolan, K. "The Use of Student Teachers in a Preventive Tutoring Program." *Teacher Education Quarterly,* 1965, *23,* 13-18.

Levine, M., Dunn, F., Brochinsky, S., Bradley, J., & Donlan, K. "Project Scranton: Service and Training in the Clinical Experience of Student Teachers. Progress Report." New Haven, Connecticut: Psycho-Educational Clinic, Yale University, 1968 (mimeographed).

Passow, A. H. (Ed.). *Education in Depressed Areas.* New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963.

Passow, A. H., Goldberg, M. & Tannenbaum, A. J. (eds.). *Education of the Disadvantaged.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

Sarason, S. B. *The Culture of the School and the Process of Change.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, in press.

Sarason, S. B., Davidson, K. & Blatt, B. *The Preparation of Teachers. An Unstudied Program in Education.* New York: John Wiley, 1962.

Sarason, S. B., Levine, M., Goldenberg, I. I., Cherlin, D. L., & Bennett, E. M. *Psychology in Community Settings.* New York: John Wiley, 1966.

Stone, J. C. *Breakthrough in Teacher Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Urban Education Is Comatose and Dying

SANDFORD REICHART
Professor of Education and Director of Teacher Education,
Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio

Urban education in America today is in a coma and unless drastic measures are taken at once it will die.

There are five major reasons for this tragic reality. Each must be changed if reversal in the process is to take place.

1—*Society.* It is in the larger context of society that we find the first reason for the deplorable state in which urban education is today. There is a deep malaise in our social order that finds many without sufficient central conviction in their own lives to be able to commit themselves to the needs of others. With fear over the future, uncertainty over political and economic destiny, confusion over technological growth, ambivalence toward moral unrest, and concern over natural resources, many have become inward and do not have energies enough to direct themselves toward the greater good of all. There is a laxity in the general quality of life which allows the many to tolerate the horror in the lives of the some. The average middle-class citizen, white and black, has come to dedicate his efforts toward the maintaining of his own life. He has too little time and thought left to give of himself to the poverty stricken. This was a fad a while back but now the order of the day is to hold the monetary line and think more of oneself. Society thinks that the problems of the urban poor take too much money, too much time, and are too tentative to allow for continued and conscientious striving toward humanistic solutions. There are too many problems suffered by the urban poor, too few handles to grab ahold, too few signs of firm results for all the money spent. The education of the urban poor is just one factor in an endless series of problems and as long as it does not affect the education of Mr. Average Citizen's children it must be shoved to one side. After all, there is a good excuse to do so since so little has been achieved. Society cares too little about urban education. It has given up. The guts to fight are gone.

2—*School Administration.* Administration responded to the needs of urban education largely as a result of pressure from various political and social forces. Rarely has one been able to observe much prevention being planned. Usually there are brush fire kinds of operations with too little planning and too much public relations hypocrisy to fill the bill. Most administrators have acted on behalf of the urban poor by plugging in more dollars and leaving everything else the same. This does little and has done little. There has been haphazard effort to change the system, and the bureaucracy has remained with the ghetto school its blight. The standards set for the middle-class white by the middle-class white have remained as the goals. The ghetto school has been labelled as deficient and the only way seen to remediate has been to provide all kinds of materials and all kinds of programs and all kinds of compensation. Very little of this has worked; the needs of the children have not been looked upon as unique because of their

unique situation. Administrators have not seen the situation as needing new forms of organization unless forced to. They have not seen the need for new kinds of education based upon different principles similar to those proposed in this article. They have been stopping up holes with spit instead of cement and as soon as the cracks have inevitably reappeared they have had their vindication, their excuse for not having done more. The truth is that without the urban poor and their ghetto schools many superintendents would not know upon whom or what to blame their failures. The poor make wonderful scapegoats and by the tragedy of being lost themselves have saved many a professional's job.

3—*Teachers.* Teachers have not had enough skill in dealing with the needs of the urban poor. Though many have tried valiantly, all too few have succeeded. They have become the victims of the school system that directs the course of events in terms of standardized norms and test requirements. All too often the approach has been a remedial one with the assumption being that the ghetto child needs to know what the middle-class child needs to know and that he must learn it whatever the way and in spite of his problems. By the time the school gets to many poor children their needs are *not* the same as their middle-class peers, and the way they will learn to cope with their problems is not the same either. The author proposes that there must be a new concept regarding the appropriatensss of education for this kind of child and the means by which he may acquire it. Ghetto teachers have been locked into verbal materials and into styles of instruction interchangeable with those in middle-class schools. By and large, they have not known enough about the psychology of the urban child, about the learning styles and disabilities, about the correlations between his social history and his academic deficiency. As a result too many classrooms have become cells and too many schools have become jails where the teachers often play the role of policemen and there is little learning but much hatred and even cruelty. All too many teachers have not been equipped to deal with their problems and as a result, white and black, they have become consciously or subconsciously racist in their teaching styles. Many have been courageous in hanging on. Others have helped to create the disaster. Few have been without some responsibility. Most have done too poor a job.

4—*Parents.* Historically, the urban poor have been powerless, unable to exercise their rights as citizens concerned over the education of their children. Yet many parents have relinquished their rights for other reasons. It cannot be surveyed as a one-way street. There are two sides and as far as parents are concerned their side is often filled with neglect, apathy and/or irresponsibility. Many have been caught up by the fight for power within the community. Others have not allowed themselves to get organized toward any cohesive effort. Many have not responded to the overtures of the school to get them involved and have not followed through when actually approached by school contacts to assist the school with the problems their children are facing. It is understood that for many parents it is too late. Their homes and their lives have been destroyed. There are other kinds, however, and those are the ones who have failed to meet their obligations as dynamically as required. All too many have sat back in the shadows and allowed the system to defeat them, to destroy their children while doing nothing. Their opportunity to support the efforts mounted to correct the

situation often found them wanting. They have not joined together and have left many a noble cause to wither away for want of their support.

5—*Students.* The students themselves have not assumed enough leadership and have accepted little responsibility for their own education. As a result in many a ghetto school there is the atmosphere of chaos, of inconsiderate behaviors threatening the feelings and well-being of others, of animals running loose. There is a climate of disrespect, a world of hostility, or a world of having given up. There may be a put-on world or a world that is flaunting the myths created around it to make its insufficiencies appear to be glories. The ghetto school is an unreal school and all too often its students are the most unreal of all. Some grasp for their feelings of beauty, some for their aspirations to make it, but all too often everyone is grabbed down into the abyss of despair by the actions of the mob. The students have converted school into a ritual of hysteria and bitterness. Somewhere and somehow they, as well as everyone else, have to be made accountable. They are the most important part of the educational enterprise and thus must be made responsive to their roles and responsibilities within it.

These five reasons add up to the reality that the schools in urban poor America are comatose and dying. The majority of society wants it that way and leaves it that way. The administration of the schools lacks the commitment toward the kinds of actions that will make systemic changes a way of life. It takes steps backward in its feeble motions forward. It conserves for the value structure of society. The teachers help create the illness by not knowing enough and by not using what they do know in the right ways. They keep themselves ineffectual by not rising to the challenges of learning more—not more of the same but more of different things. The parents do not infuse a sense of expectancy into the invalid state, an expectancy that things will get better, *must* get better. Instead, they often abdicate responsibility and take what they get. They do not demand that while there is still life there must be a greater chance to breathe freely and cleanly. The students themselves quicken the death by dreaming too little and by acting out too much. They take everything and give nothing. They see their time as here, a time to grab and not to ask.

It is death and it must change or we will have served, each one of us, as assassinators.

The answer appears to be in a new conception for the role of the urban school. Such a role may be understood best in the context of *prevention.* Administration must mount massive programs of prevention if urban education is to survive. Remediation as the emphasis is too late. There must be a commitment to prevent or we will run endlessly through the corridors without a point of return.

Such prevention has to begin with programs of *diagnosis.* This diagnosis should include every aspect of the student's life processes from his social to his physical, from his emotional to his mental, including his patterns of learning and his patterns of disability. Teachers can be taught many techniques for diagnosis and can undertake a new dimension in their professional roles as a result. They need not wait for referrals to detect many gross difficulties and may be able to develop skills necessary to discern numerous specific disabilities. This is the first step if teachers are to individualize for children. They have to know them better.

Once diagnosis has been completed, the teacher should *evaluate* the results

in terms of designing those *strategies of instruction* and those *materials of content* best suited to the individual's profile of needs. Once such rational decision-making is undertaken and once the teacher's actions become conscious, he may begin the appropriate education for the urban child.

Such an education is based upon *treatment*. This might be treatment for an emotional disorder or treatment for a conceptual difficulty. It might include treatment for a neurological disability or for confusion in a sensory channel. The assumption is that no child is able to learn according to his potential unless his disabilities are treated as part of or preceding such learning.

The urban child is often the victim of institutional deprivation, including the school. As such he has developed patterns of disorder that block him from learning in a positive sense. In order for him to acquire functional residuals he must be provided with the treatment necessary. Here again we have a different role for the teacher and a different responsibility for the school.

The school can no longer hide behind the blinders of misconceptions regarding retardation. Most retarded children in the schools are functional retardates, which means there is nothing organically wrong with them and a good many of them have been made that way through negligent education in the schools. It is a scandal and if ever to be corrected the public must get wise to it.

It is the author's conviction that the kind of schooling most children in the urban pockets have received is unrealistic. For the most part it has been watered down from middle-class expectations or it has been a remedial approach with the nearly impossible task of attempting to undo years and years of educational and institutional waste. Therefore, most urban education has been characterized by feeble attempts at getting the students involved in compensatory kinds of experiences, with the assumption being that given the right teacher with the right program there will be a difference. This does not appear to have been the case. Wondrously, of course, some children do make it, but they are in the minority and even those who do make it often do not have enough strength in their training to provide them with the tools for continued growth. Therefore, the schools have fostered mediocrity without ever having looked at the source of the problems in an altruistically objective manner.

The school has not accepted the fact that it is, as presently constituted, the wrong kind of institution for all too many children. If it is to be an institution to meet urban needs its emphasis has to shift to that of a *diagnostic* and *treatment center*. Under such an approach the learner's strengths would be assessed in order that his program could maximize those strengths and another program be devised to evaluate and minimize his weaknesses. There would be the assumption that he has been disabled by life and school, and that only drastic measures can reverse the cycle. Each of his characteristics would be analyzed and treatment would be provided for each area. Therefore, he would have one program for his social disabilities, another for his perceptual needs, another for his physical development, and so it would go.

The emphasis would be placed upon his self-containment, his ability to live within himself in a positive and constructive fashion. Then, there would be a shift to his social control, or his abilities at using himself in a group situation. Such an approach would provide him with tools for his all too fragile emotional

life. Then, the treatment would move toward his abilities to deal with his body in a positive, meaningful and proud manner. After such actions had been undertaken his cognitive needs would be assessed and individual programs would be devised for his special difficulties. These difficulties would have to be called by what they all too often are, disabilities. At the first stage, then, the focus would be upon providing him with coping mechanisms rather than absolute cure. He must be given the power of expressing himself as a total person in spite of his deficiencies. The latter might remain with him but could be modified by the assertion of strengths in other manifestations.

The flow, then, is from *diagnosis* to *evaluation* to *decision-making* leading to the *design of strategies of instruction* to the creation of the necessary *materials of content* to the implementation of *treatment*. Then the cycle repeats itself with *ongoing* diagnosis and evaluation and the making of new decisions with their resultant new strategies and the creation of new materials and the implementation of new or different levels of treatment.

The above formula requires a commitment on the part of society and its school boards to look upon the school in a different way. It costs more money, demands new staffing patterns, and requires the training of teachers in and their recognition of newly acquired professional techniques. The helping professions must become involved. Through a gigantic *intervention* program of this type, with everyone dedicated to impact, change can come about.

It is foolish to believe that such change can come about through halfhearted efforts or through efforts whose emphases are on the wrong elements. Once and for all we have to recognize the problem in all its ugliness. Once and for all we have to devise new methods, while acknowledging that the old ones are the gatekeepers of ancient fables. Once and for all we have to realize that we are cutting children off from continuity with an exciting future. Rather, we are foreordaining a destiny that is filled with insufficient promise of love and a pale promise of fulfillment.

The contents of this paper are not lightly proposed, nor based on mere theorizing. The concepts here have been lived with for a long while. The seeds may be found in the *Taxonomic Teaching Project,* Teachers College, Columbia University, where the author as associate director has tested many of the ideas presented here. Currently, in a joint project between Case Western Reserve University and the East Cleveland Schools where the author is director, many of these same ideas are being used as a training vehicle for teachers who are looking at students in this proposed diagnostic manner. It seems appropriate to mention these projects because though such isolated involvement cannot hold back the overwhelming nature of the urban education problem, they are examples of placing dreams into action. If in doing so the initial steps are uncertain, at least they express themselves as a walk in the right direction, as acts of faith toward those who have been hurt and must be hurt no more.

Urban education's only purpose should be to serve human needs with honesty and with elegance. If it serves no more than society's conscience, it is better dead.

The Need for Supplemental Urban Educational Institutions

JAMES W. ELSBERY
Director, Community Division, Center for Urban Education, New York, New York

This paper deals with three aspects of American urban education from a sociohistorical position. Listed briefly, they are (1) the formal educational system's inability to effectively share power with poor and nonwhite city dwellers; (2) its inability to prepare their children for full admission into America's socio-economic life; (3) and because of (1) or (2), its need for appropriate help in order to avoid further violence and erosion of legitimacy in the eyes of the poor and nonwhite of the nation's inner cities. The author will attempt to prove—philosophically and sociologically—that further damage to urban schools can be avoided by the introduction of supplementary educational subsystems which stand between the existing formal school structures and the home and community.

It is not my intention to spell out specific mechanisms of the supplementary educational center as a solution to the problems urban education has been facing for years. Nor will this paper present (except tangentially) specific ways of improving academic performance of the inner-city poor and nonwhite child.

Supplementary educational centers, as envisioned here, are places located within geographic boundaries of urban school districts. They are designed to meet specific needs, aims and goals of the school personnel in the district, students attending district schools and children and adult residents in the area. These centers would be utilized for community-school solving of school district problems; developing programs that will assist the school and community to better perform their educational functions related to the student and school district residents, as articulated by both groups. In effect, supplementary institutions are places where participation and involvement in educational matters related to the district are of primary importance.

NEED FOR SUPPLEMENTARY URBAN EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Supplementary urban educational institutions are required if our educational system is to meet the needs both nationally and regionally of economic, industrial, political complexes as well as the needs of the inner-city minorities. The demands of inner-city minority groups, be they Black, Spanish-speaking, and/or poor, will have to be met for three reasons: (1) their growing political and economic strength makes them a force to be attended to; (2) their aggressive behavior has struck the walls of the educational citadel with sufficient force to jeopardize its structure; and (3) for the sake of the larger social order, sufficient human resources are needed to tend the fires of our technological furnaces and keep our economic growth relatively pure without too much unemployment, welfare and crime slag.

None of the above reasons touch upon the ethical, moral or democratic reasons for meeting the demands and granting the rights of so large a minority. Nor do any of the above reasons touch upon the obvious fact that any improvement in the educational process for a minority child is an automatic gain for a majority white child. Whatever we can learn about the learning process or the teaching process that can make a significant positive change in this academic performance of any group of children will directly or indirectly accrue to the benefit of all children, if properly applied.

The Existing Situation: The Poor

The term "poor" has been utilized to classify a group of individuals as a minority. Few Americans would deny that nonwhites—such as Puerto Ricans, Mexicans, Indians and Blacks—are minority groups who suffer the additional prejudice and mistreatment that are attached to such a classification. The poor generally may not be visible except, as is often the case, when they also fit into one of the aforementioned minority groups, but they are a receiver of shoddy educational goods and treatment.

The treatment the poor receive is in part an outgrowth of Protestantism. Those who "make it" financially are considered to be among God's chosen. But, in any case, they are not entitled to the same fruits of the land or the rights of that land. Out of charity on the part of God's chosen (for God's chosen must be charitable if they truly wish to see heaven), the poor are to be taken care of, but only minimally. Nothing must blunt the drive on the part of the poor to make it economically; for if they finally make it, then their previous condition was not only temporary but a test, and they too are among God's chosen. Only those who never move up are forever doomed.

Most of these Calvinistic theories are no longer articulated but they have molded this nation's thinking in many ways. One ready example is the fact that "the Protestant ethic" and the concept that work is "pure and good," is as much a part of the cultural heritage of the Catholic and Jew as of the Protestant, but few understand or are aware of its origins.

Our behavior indicates that attitudes toward poverty have been so ingrained that we now react almost instinctively to the problem. The philosophy underlying these attitudes is readily seen in many of our laws. Examination of the laws related to the poor reveals the strong hand of these religious concepts not only in the writing but also in the execution. Family assistance regulations and the entire welfare program were initially set up as charitable endeavors on the part of the "chosen" to minimally help the unfortunate at the bottom. Today, there is no sense of worth or dignity given to those who are on welfare by either the way the law addresses them or is executed for them. What is worse is the general attitude of those not on welfare towards those who are. Those on welfare are perceived as being shirkers, fakers and clearly sinners who have no right to welfare and who now that they have received charity are ungratefully asking for more. At the same time we note that larger and larger sums go to those who have and expedite the bureaucratic structure established to carry out the welfare programs. We also note the outrageous sums given by this structure to those "who have"

in comparison to those who "have not." It would be interesting to determine how much actually goes to the poor versus how much goes to the bureaucratic structure and renters.

What is most disturbing is the fact that the same society which claims it is being impoverished by having to pay for those on welfare has itself created the vast majority of the poor. With the defeat of Reconstruction, society declared "them" either 3/5 citizens (if the poor happen to be Blacks) or unfit to rule or fully share in the socioeconomic system of the nation, and proceeded to educate and treat them accordingly. Inferior education for the "inferior" seemed not only appropriate but humanitarian by such thinking. One hundred years later the self-fulfilling prophecy is not only economically and psychologically strangling its victims but also victimizing its perpetrators. Yet, Americans today look at the results without accepting or noting the cause and believe and act as though the demands now being made by the poor and nonwhite are as illegitimate and unwarranted as those declared by their ancestors. The dominant group does little and permits little to be done to alter the spiralling cycle of psychological, educational and economic degradation that has been consistent and pervasive for those who have for generations made up the poor and/or nonwhite.

Of late, there have been many pleas to change the laws related to the poor but we have been inordinately slow in changing them or our attitudes. Considering the deep-rooted quality of our religious and social prejudices, the rate of progress is about on schedule. What has been unfortunate for the poor, white as well as the nonwhite, is the fact that the majority of nonwhites have been relegated to the lowest economic status. This fact has inured to the detriment of both groups, for being nonwhite adds the stigma of bigotry which is far more corrosive than just being poor. Therefore, all of those who are poor are more often than not seen as also being Black, Puerto Rican, or Indian; and thereby, clearly the "nonchosen" and poor whites are psychologically indistinguishable from the group. Certainly this was so during the Depression of the 1930s when many of "God's chosen" lost their fortunes. This was also the beginning of a modification in the thinking and attitudes on poverty.

Struggle for Survival Within the Urban School

But having clarified and categorized the poor as one of the minority groups, we can now appreciate the demands that this group, and the other minorities, have made upon the educational system. To document these demands may seem to be superfluous. Yet, if one is to understand why a supplementary institution is necessary and necessary now, then awareness and understanding of the depth and types of needs, and the reasons why the demands have not been met prior to now and may not be met even now without help, are all crucially relevant.

Within the last two decades there has been a major struggle waged by minority groups against the formal educational system. That struggle has been in phases. The first phase had as its objective entry into all public schools—the desegregation phase. School segregation is based upon ethnicity and socioeconomic status. The latter is clearly valid under the neighborhood school concept. The second period aimed for marked academic achievement on the part

of the minority children in the inner-city public schools. It is true that in part the significant difference in academic achievement of the minority child in relation to the white majority child helped to foster the desegregation movement of phase one, but by phase two it was possible to see a major thrust on the part of organized groups to lift the academic achievement records of minorities. Yet quality education did not come to the nonwhite and poor. More often than not they found themselves being called "culturally deprived" or "disadvantaged" and being informed that the educational problem resided within either their homes or themselves. Even when they accepted such fallacies (for what humans do not have a culture or are "culturally disadvantaged"?) and ego destructive concepts, no statistically significant change was seen in their educational performance because of compensatory education or comparable programs. One is not really looking for the solution of the problem in the formal educational system but instead is looking to find the flaw in the client, student and community.

Having found that phases one and two met with little success, the third phase was a thrust for school control. This phase was seen most keenly in the inner cities across this nation. New York City—because of the size of its minority populations, teachers' union and importance as a bastion of academic riches—probably received more publicity with regard to phase three than any other city in the nation.

Phase three—it is possible to conjecture—prodded the federal, state and local governments to establish programs which were intended to achieve the objectives of phase two: improvement of academic achievement. Phase three resulted in boycotts, riots and even physical violence. True, some of these actions were going on in the other two phases but not to the same degree. However, it must be noted that many cities have still not reached phase three and may be in phase one or perhaps two. They are making a monumental mistake if they assume that what happened in New York has passed them by. Phase three may not arrive if they rapidly achieve the objectives of phases one and two. If not, the results for those educational systems and other systems in those cities may be disruptive and system-power changing beyond their expectations. The minorities in those cities will have learned from the members of their minority communities in New York City and elsewhere, and will be both more organized and more powerful.

The yearning and the drive for quality education go on unabated. Because phase three has not yet reached a number of major cities across this nation, there may be a way to avoid open conflict, achieve phase two, and develop an appropriate educational administrative structure that admits the minority communities to the hall of power and positions of gatekeepers. In this way, all parties will achieve their alleged goals: the positive self-concept; high academic achievement; and access to the mainstream of economic, social and political security in a pluralistic society for all students.

The Issue

What has brought us to the position where we are in effect engaged in a power struggle? Are we not witnessing a sincere desire on the part of parents to

help their own children and have some say along with the professional about how both the quality and quantity of help are to be given and under what conditions and by whom?

The demands of the minorities for some school control have been perceived as inappropriate. As already noted these minorities—Blacks, Spanish speaking, Indians and poor—were never seen as part of the "white family" power structure. They were in a real sense never regarded as being other than marginal. The demands of these minority groups are viewed in an almost irrational light. Thus, the issue is first one of legitimation, at least in the eyes of the existing educational power structure.

The majority structure is aware that adaptation is the keynote to survival when fighting with a legitimate antagonist. However, you fight longer and harder with an illegitimate antagonist and have the support of all other parts of the system that only relate to "legitimacy," no matter how dysfunctional that part of the system being attacked is. In the days of chivalry, a knight of the realm was not permitted to fight with either a commoner or an attainted knight. The fact that one had been injured unjustly did not give one the right to settle differences by a joust. The right was based upon being perceived as being the equal before the law (with the social mores supporting it) of your opponent. Such is not the case for these minority groups.

In the present educational struggle, many in the controlling camp do not perceive this need for equality on the part of the minority groups and themselves; therefore, for them, legitimation does not exist. The result is that, in their view, the grievance should be handled not by the aggrieved but by the aggressor, according to the prescribed code of chivalry of the day. This results in such statements as "We will have to work with you in doing . . ." or "We will set up programs in which parents are educated to the problems of the school" or "We will appoint someone from a community agency to be on our advisory board."

The minorities within the inner cities of this nation have made it plain that whether or not legitimacy is granted or even won in this struggle, they will continue the fight until they have sufficient control to create an education that will help their children make it into the mainstream of our social, political and economic life. It is becoming increasingly clear that the growing economic and political power of these groups, flowing from their value to the industrial economy as workers and consumers, will force the sociopolitical power structures in control of education to legitimize their struggle in some face-saving manner and produce appropriate concessions to their demands.

Rationale for Change

One can therefore see that the American educational institution—never having been set up to meet the needs, let alone the demands, of these newly arising power groups—would be ill equipped to meet their requests even if it wanted to. When one adds the fact that under the control of systems whose best interests could allegedly be served by reducing, if not eliminating, the rights and powers of these minorities, then the reason for slow fulfillment of minority demands becomes more obvious. When a final factor is added, the major change agents

of these various systems—be they the family, legal, social or political—have shown but limited and cautious recognition of the rights and demands of the minority groups, then the slow acceptance of the rights of these minorities is understandable on the part of the educational system.

Not to be forgotten is the fact that the members of the educational system are also members of these varied social groupings. Often they see their professions and livelihoods, as well as their power within the educational system, threatened by the actions of these minority groups directed towards the public educational system. All these factors help to explain not only the slowness of the system to change in response to the minority groups demands but also the inability of minority groups to be better organized and become part of the power structure. These groups have deliberately never been given significant entree into the halls of power, nor were they trained or given the necessary skills to aid them in their own cause.

Supplementary Institutions Have Historical Precedence

One should not suppose that the introduction of a supplementary system or institution is new or radical. At one time in the history of our educational system, the one-room schoolhouses dominated in various parts of the country. The community — those who could afford to — hired the teacher, told her or him what to teach, and what not to teach, determined the rules of conduct that the teacher was to abide by, and the teacher acted accordingly. In a sense, the little red schoolhouse stood as a supplementary system between the home and the community. The school and its personnel were responsible to the community. In that system, the personnel were aware of being a service to the community system and to the family units making up that wider system.

With growth came more than increased staffing, facilities and bureaucratic structure. Instead of local community norms the structure had to meet, at best, city and state norms. In time, the structure and new norms became institutionalized. The structure developed a "life" unto itself. By the nature of its size, work force and interfacing with other systems, it was no longer capable of maintaining the aims and goals of local service and local educational needs. This is, in fact, an oversimplification of the events and circumstances which led to the change in our educational system. Equally, it is an oversimplification of the aims and goals of that system, but it does highlight the critical point that supplementary institutions are not revolutionary or novel but are an aspect of our history.

New Needs and Demands Require New or Improved Structures

As a nation we have grown to where the generalities and broad concepts of city, state, federal and world information no longer are enough. Communities have developed to where they are both alike and highly distinct. The children and adults in these areas have very real educational needs and learning styles, requiring community-oriented remedies. Part of this is due to the fact that the poor and nonwhites who were never really fully taken into account in setting up our educational system are becoming more and more a major element of its

student makeup. These same groups are becoming needed in the economy. The educational system has failed them. As a result, they become more dependent upon the system to support and care for them; they revolt against the system since they have fewer options and power over their life styles; their value to the system is less at a time when they are needed to run the machinery and buy the goods; the system is viewed with a critical eye for the first time by critics and gatekeeper mostly from without but also from within; the performance of that educational system with regard to the white middle-class child is examined and found wanting; varied plans for correcting the condition—from improving any and all factors within the existing system to establishing alternate educational systems—have been proposed.

Supplementary Intermediate Institution as an Answer

Something must be done for and with children in school during this period of searching, especially those children from the inner cities of this nation who are poor, nonwhite or both. Something must be done to prevent the once again growing pressures against the school systems across the country that appear to be heading towards potential boycotting and picketing, at best, and assaults upon educational personnel and rioting, at the worst. Finally, something must be done to prevent other generations from having to go through the same type of ordeal. But how does one educate for *vigilance* in a democracy—vigilance that prevents some other groups from being outside the pale of the educational, economic and social mainstream which gives us our sense of citizenship and group belonging?

At the outset, it was stated that all of our cities had not reached phase three, "thrust for school control." The adoption of an intermediate institution would be a suitable solution to the demands of both parties, those outside asking for entry and those inside afraid of being put out. The intent is not to simply meet demands related to relieving the pressure or tension. The solution presented is to accomplish all three of the problems discussed here: the educational system's inability to effectively teach the poor, nonwhite; the growing antagonism and perception of the education system being illegitimate; as well as development of citizen participation in place of citizen noninvolvement and apathy.

The supplementary institution has several primary goals. First and foremost, intermediate learning institutions would have as their major objective the catalytic effect of bringing those who have been relegated to less than full educational opportunities together with the formal educational establishment. They would be brought together in the setting of neutral territory with the objective to aid the formal educational system in establishing new lines of communication with the citizens of inner-city communities. These supplementary institutions would be established by organizations that are respected by both contending forces (the school systems and community groups) and through them and the programs and activities that take place in these institutions, legitimacy would be achieved.

Two features of such an institution have been mentioned: (1) the creation of a working, cooperative relationship between the nonwhite and poor and the

formal educational structure and (2) bringing this about without violence and with greater speed than if left to the devices of either or both protagonists. There is another objective whose primacy is not as immediate but is surely more important to the nation's shibboleths of pluralism and democracy; that objective is citizen participation—participation on the part of all citizens to the full extent of the law and with equal protection under and equal ability to utilize the law.

School systems across this nation have not taught and ingrained, in the same way that they have ingrained socialization features into students, the importance of participation on the part of all children—including the poor and nonwhite. In part, this results from the fact that the forms of education given to the poor and nonwhite were of such inferior calibre that these marginal members of our social system were never able to partake of the full fruits of the American socioeconomic table. Without such, a disparity had to develop between participation and fulfillment of ambitions. The marginal man had participated once, surely the Blackman had. Although never fully accepted as a full citizen he had voted in large numbers, fought in the Revolutionary War, voted thereafter, even been courted for his vote by the Southern politician. In time, however, this too changed, for participation meant increased desire to partake of all of those fruits and to be able to sit down to the table as well. The moment in history came (and in terms of history this can be such a long period of time for those experiencing the degradation) when he had to decide whether it was more important to give up his right to vote in order to survive, i.e., in order not to be killed. The decision was to reduce participation not out of desire but out of fear in the belief that this was but a battle in a long series of battles for not just freedom but equality; ultimately they would win that war.

In the intervening period, much happened and most of it has been destructive for the nonwhite and poor. One result was the inability to any longer look back and see a relationship between participation and becoming a part of the socioeconomic power structure. And on the few occasions where this seemed possible the question was whether one had to give up too much of self for this ability to participate.

The time appears to have arrived when the forces are not equal but when there are conflicting groups of considerable power. There are rational men in all camps, and there is still an underlying belief in the democratic and pluralistic ethic on the part of the majority of these camps. If the dreams of our past, which have often been nightmarish in our present, are to have any chance of becoming dreams of glory in the waking hours of our future then the marginal man must have equal access to all parts of the system. That access must be based upon ability and the rights of citizenship. But neither his ability nor his citizenship should be tampered with so that he finds himself ill equipped and incapable of participation. That is what has been done to him in the past. That is what the formal educational system appears to be doing to his children today. That is what must not be done to him tomorrow. This is what education for citizen participation can prevent. This must be a primary goal of supplementary learning centers.

Programs would be developed in these institutions that would inform community adults and students on the working of the educational system. Programs

would be developed that would give these participants skills and information required for evaluating, testing and participating in the vital systems affecting their lives and those of their children. These programs would be for all citizens in the school district. Through such a mechanism it becomes more and more difficult if not impossible for future groups to be placed in the marginal position with regard to the educational system. They will know too much and, it is hoped, will have become enough a part of it and have acquired sufficient gate-keeping positions to prevent closure upon themselves. More important they will have had access to the curricula and thereby access to the minds of the nation. This access will come to all member groups of the community, new and old. The intent is that the effects of programs developed in these learning centers will be fed back into the formal school system in the district. Participation in the educational process should lead to educational change.

Other Expected Outcomes

The changes that are believed to be possible through supplementary learning centers relate to giving access to the educational process to all Americans, that access being one in which tracking and shuttling systems do not relegate those in power to one section of the formal system with high socioeconomic outcomes and those who are "illegitimate" power-seekers (the poor and nonwhite) to lesser sections with comparable socioeconomic outcomes. Access does not merely mean opening the door to all, it means seeing to it that all have equal opportunity to take advantage of that open door. To miseducate and then to open doors to schools and industry and then reject applicants because they are miseducated or poorly educated is *not* to have opened doors.

None of what has been presented touches upon the need to better understand how the human learning process works. The introduction of supplementary institutions is not perceived as being directly related to the basic research needed in this area. But for whatever we learn about the learning process and about teaching, if that knowledge is not utilized to the advantage of all children then it will become a millstone around the neck of the democratic process. To unequally distribute scientific goods to all citizens is as destructive as to unequally distribute the social and economic goods of the nation. This has been the practice towards the poor and nonwhite of the nation. Our past indicates that this has been the practice of the formal educational system as well. The introduction of supplementary institutions would make the continuation of unequal distribution of educational skills, information and services exceedingly difficult and unlikely.

These institutions would help to establish a new framework for new lines of communication. They would help to create more egalitarian ways of interacting and interfacing within the educational structure. They would help to set a tone so that we could think in terms of one day being a technological social system that is democratic and pluralistic in practice as well as in theory. Then we would be able to use the many technological and scientific achievements and discoveries for the betterment of ourselves and posterity instead of continuing the degradation of the democratic dogma.

A Model for Relevant Urban Education

HANSOM PRENTICE BAPTISTE, JR., AND CARMELITA O. MEINDL
Assistant Professors of Education, Indiana University at South Bend, Indiana

In the development of urban education a large number of educational models are being implemented under the auspices of educational programs which are Federally funded. Any educational model proposed for an urban population should contain components which are effective in enabling this population not only to confront their subjugated plight but also to free themselves of this plight.

In order to comprehend the extent of the multifaceted plight of the urban population, the authors recommend the *Black Scholar*'s issue entitled "Black Cities: Colonies or City States?"[1] This issue points out that the end of the seventies will find Black majorities in the major cities of this country; however, a majority does not necessarily mean power, nor guarantee effective political, economic and social control of the city. In effect these cities may become large superghettos: anemic urban colonies suffering from insidious exploitation by the suburbs and exurbs. Neocolonialism of urban areas is being developed under the guise of concerned programs such as Model Cities, Urban Renewal and Public Housing which saturate the urban community with much propaganda and little capital. This is further pointed out in the same issue of *Black Scholar*:

> The most acute problem confronting cities with rising or predominantly black populations in the 1970's is the *strengthening of the racist normative* patterns structurally imbedded in the organizations crucial to black survival, organizations which we must control. This is the peculiar character of urban racism, and the problem facing blacks seeking political control in complex urban areas. It is clear that the critical organizations which have been confronted by black demands utilize liberal goals, but that the patterns which sustain their day-to-day operation are blatantly racist. The simplest description of this phenomenon is the difference between focusing upon the *stated goals* of urban school systems, as opposed to altering their *patterns* which subjugate black children through local control. Placed in another perspective, the issue at stake is that organizational goals, politically, socially, and budgetarily can only be changed if blacks control the patterns of influence and establish new "rules of the game." Achieving this control is not going to be simple.[2]

The purpose of this paper is not only to stress the plight of the Black but also to present the philosophy of an action program at Indiana University being utilized to train or retrain urban people in educational careers. Two basic objectives of this program were (a) to provide curriculum, instruction and supported

[1] *Black Scholar*, April, 1970 (San Francisco: Black World Foundation).
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

services that would facilitate the training of model cities residents as paraprofessionals and certified teachers and (b) to promote and bring about a change in the training program for elementary school teachers at Indiana University at South Bend.

Selection of participants for the program was done by the Community Advisory Council and its advisory staff. Initially in August, 1970, forty participants were admitted to the program. This number has now increased to fifty-four. The following criteria were used as the basis for admittance to the program:

(a) the participant must meet OEO poverty guidelines;
(b) the participant must have a desire to work with urban city children in a school setting;
(c) the participant must have been recommended by the community advisory council;
(d) the participant's need and desire for further education must be beyond his economic status; and
(e) the participant need not have a high school diploma.

The curriculum was developed to meet the academic needs as well as the vocational training needs of the participants. The effectiveness of the curriculum was enhanced by (a) on the job training for the participant, (b) academic courses constructed to meet his general and professional educational needs and (c) supported services of both an academic and nonacademic nature.

The on the job training phase of the program took place at three elementary and a junior high school in the model cities area, five Title I schools, several headstart centers, a parochial school and a migrant center. The participants were required to spend 20 hours per week at one of the designated locations. A large number of the participants were placed as aides in the elementary classrooms, the rest were designated as library, migrant or Title I aides.

The rationale to support this facet of the program is that adults are being trained to work with children in the same kind of situations which the participant is going to perform when he has graduated from the program. Furthermore, it is believed that educational theory becomes sterile and anemic in substance when it is devoid of immediate practical use in instructional situations with children. Good educational practice situations may far outshine educational theory in the training and development of paraprofessionals and teachers. This does not mean that educational theory is unimportant. It just supports the idea that the validity of any theory is substantially tied to its functional practice.

Support for substantial emphasis on on the job training for paraprofessionals and teachers come from Charles Silberman. In his chapter, "The Teacher as Student: What's Wrong with Teacher Education," he writes:

> While the inadequacies of teacher education are more serious for teachers going into urban slum schools, I have yet to meet a teacher in a middle-class suburban school who considered his preparation even remotely adequate. On the contrary, the great majority agree with the judgment of Seymour Sarason of Yale, that "the contents and procedures of teacher education frequently have no demonstrable relevance to the actual teaching task." One

> reason they have no relevance is that many educationists are as far removed from the public schools as they are from the arts and sciences faculties. Most of the innovations in elementary education . . . and some of the most exciting experiments in secondary education have had their origins outside the school of education. On the other hand, the educationists have been so removed from the schools — so uninformed about what life in the classroom is really like — that they have also failed to prepare their students for the schools as they now are. To be sure, many education professors began their careers as public school teachers. But given their own desire for status together with the Academy's disdain for schooling, they tend to give the schools wide berth once they join an education faculty. . . . Until the racial crisis erupted into violence in the mid-1960's, moreover, most education faculties went about their business as if the public schools catered to nothing but an upper-middle-class white clientele.[3]

This ridiculous hiatus which theory and practice are suffering in education has been attacked before, along with the evil results it perpetrates. The following quote also points out the disadvantages of the separation of educational principles and "empirical classroom experiences" that stagnate the teacher, teaching and learning.

> Remarkably little has changed, in fact, since 1904, when John Dewey described the unhappy consequences of the failure to relate theory and practice in teacher education. The teacher coming out of the usual teacher training school, he wrote, has not received "the training which affords psychological insight — which enables him to judge promptly (and therefore almost automatically) the kind and mode of subject-matter which the pupil needs at a given moment to keep his attention moving forward effectively and healthfully. He does know, however, that he must maintain order; that he must keep the attention of the pupils fixed upon his own questions, suggestions, instructions, and remarks, and upon their "lessons" for that, after all, was the way he was taught. The result, Dewey continued, is that the student adjusts his actual methods of teaching, not to the principles which he is acquiring, but to what he sees succeed and fail in an empirical way from moment to moment; what he sees other teachers doing who are more experienced and successful in keeping order than he is; and to the injunctions and directions given him by others. In this way the controlling habits of the teacher get fixed with comparatively little reference to principles in the psychology, logic, and history of education. . . . Here we have the explanation, in considerable part at least, of the dualism, the unconscious duplicity, which is one of the chief evils of the teaching profession. There is an enthusiastic devotion to certain principles of lofty theory in the abstract —principles of self-activity, self-control, intellectual and moral—and there is a school practice taking little heed of the official pedagogic creed. Theory and practice do not grow together out of and into the teacher's personal experience.[4]

Although for purposes of clarity, the on the job training facet is being described separately from the academic courses and supported services, all three are viewed as interlocking components.

---

[3] Charles E. Silberman, *Crisis in the Classroom* (New York: Random House, 1970).
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 459.

In this facet of the program participants receive supervision and training from classroom teachers, resource teachers, counselors, university instructors, administrators and children. The participants may be assigned to one or two classrooms, and while involved in this program work directly with a resource teacher. Subsequently, they are involved in special programs relating either to reading, social studies or mathematics. The participants are not only involved in the "How to" part of these programs but also the "Why" part of these programs. Consequently they are engaged in both the *theory* and *practice* of the programs.

Participants assigned to classrooms become involved very early with children in supportive and instructional tasks. This includes the construction of visual materials, clerical duties, storytelling, developing bulletin boards, one-to-one tutoring, small-group instruction and recreation supervision.

The university instructors are constantly in contact with the classroom teachers. They receive information about the participants' progress and performance in the classroom. Suggestions for improvement may be made by the classroom teachers in the areas of cognitive, affective, social and managerial aspects of the training program. University instructors have not had a great amount of influence on the classroom teacher. However, the receptiveness of the teachers has been good but not to the extent of bringing about a significant change in their attitudes and instructional approaches. It appears as if part of this may be due to the inherent rigidity of the administrative structure of public schools today.

Courses were not plagued with the sterile isolatedness that usually characterizes teacher-training courses. Even if a university instructor wanted to enter the "ivory tower" his students would bring him back to the real world of classrooms with urban children, because the students were there today and would be returning tomorrow. Furthermore, the training had a very concrete purpose—the preparing of paraprofessionals and teachers committed to work in urban schools. There was no wondering about the weaknesses of our urban schools. Since most of these students had received their education in these schools they knew their weaknesses and as their courses progressed they became cognizant of some of the reasons for the existence of these weaknesses. This led to a healthy reservation about the "goodness" of any educational theory until it had been tried. Although they realized that a major cause for their urban schools being ineffective was racism and economic discrimination, it was not long before they added indifference, stupidity, ignorance and lack of concern on the part of administrators, teachers and community people as other causal factors for the weaknesses of urban schools. One may lecture about the negativism of an indifferent attitude about education to a group of students not involved in an on the job training program and receive some response. But if the students are involved in an on the job training program, the lecture can very quickly evolve into a discussion with the students providing examples of indifferent attitudes and the sad results of this. They don't need hypothetical, irrelevant examples cited because many are constantly in contact with illustrations of inhumane treatment of themselves and children.

Examples: — She treats me as bad as she treats the children. (An aide referring to her cooperating classroom teacher.)

— She will not let me plan with her, nor will she allow me to see her lesson plans. (An aide talking about her cooperating classroom teacher.)

— Mrs. X treats me like an adult and makes me feel good. She is also doing some interesting things which excite and motivate the children. But my other teacher and some of the rest of the teachers are doing the same old dull things and they criticize Mrs. X. (An aide talking about her cooperating classroom teacher.)

Examples similar to the preceding ones are recited, sometimes spontaneously, in the practicum seminars. Discussion of an issue usually led our students to a new awareness of the complex problems surrounding it. For example, several of the students began observing a certain uneasiness about their cooperating teachers when they inquire about a particular technique or method of instruction. Suggestions by students to cooperating teachers quite often were given verbal recognition with no change in the teacher's instructional actions. A number of inferences would evolve, but one in particular was that the teachers felt insecure and threatened by their aides. As one aide stated, "many of their classroom teachers were not up-to-date on child psychology theories, methods of teaching language arts or social studies, and knew it. Whereas we (the aides) were learning the new methods now."

Devoting a course to an analysis of the role of a paraprofessional in a classroom coupled with the fact that the students were in classrooms gave an unbelievable vitality to the courses. In many cases there was a mutual sharing of ideas between the student and the cooperating teacher and they planned the instructional activities together. The aide was given the opportunity to perform instructional activities with the teacher or by himself. A student in this kind of situation was always motivated to share his knowledge from the university with his cooperating teacher because he was sure of getting a chance to try it out. Needless to say, the university instructors would be apprised of the results.

The courses at Indiana University at South Bend were designed and conducted to instruct the student in the skills necessary for him to function efficiently as a teacher aide, and also provide the first two years of an elementary teacher-training program. At the end of two years of study the student is awarded an Associate Degree of Educational Technology. A student may then enter the university's four-year degree teacher-training program where he may need only two or three more years of credit to complete the four-year degree program.

Certain courses focused on such academic areas as Communications, Science, Afro-American History and Mathematics for the general education of the student, while other courses focused on the student's professional education. The courses were programmed in a sequential pattern to build the student's skills.

An orientation program for the students included a Family Seminar and dealt with the problems of defining the paraprofessional role, especially for the coming semester. The intent of the Family Seminar was to involve the Family unit in the educational endeavor of the paraprofessional. Some topics discussed

in the Family Seminar were Education — A Family Affair; Your Schools — A Vital Asset and the Culture of a Community.

During the Fall Semester the students enrolled in Communications, The American Public Schools, Practicum in Educational Technology and Special Endorsement in Chosen Field. The Communications course sought (1) to enable the student to recognize the validity of the Black dialect along with the standard dialect and to sense the appropriateness of each and (2) to use the medium of Black writings for providing a relevant setting to help the student improve his reading and writing skills. The American Public Schools course included: (1) an examination of the role of the public school in American Society from a historical perspective as well as an examination of current issues and trends; (2) an examination of organizational patterns of schools and classrooms and what these patterns were intended to do; and (3) an examination of urban city schools and some of the problems and issues they must face if they are to be reformed.

The Practicum in Educational Technology was taken each semester. It served a dual purpose; first, it provided an arena for the students to discuss many of their classroom problems and issues as mentioned earlier and, secondly, part of the practicum was utilized for the identification and teaching of tasks the student was expected to perform in the classroom. Instruction ranged from the construction of audiovisual materials to the examination of the relationships between the music of a number of cultures in terms of the constituent and expressive elements of music. Evaluation of the student's performance in the classroom led to the creation of the Special Endorsement in Chosen Field course. The students were evaluated as to how well they were able to perform their tasks and apply learned concepts. Formal and informal evaluations were made by their co-operating instructors, team leaders and university personnel. A student could only receive credit for the practicum and the special endorsement if he were enrolled in both during the same semester.

Other courses taken during this first year of study were Science, Recreational Leadership, Crafts and Designs, Ethnic Group Recognition in Public Schools and How Children Learn. Instruction in the Ethnic Group Recognition emphasized effective and meaningful methods to incorporate in the elementary curriculum relevant ethnic material. The How Children Learn course was orientated toward working with urban and culturally different children. This course was aimed at giving the student an understanding of how children learn and the relationship of learning to their social, emotional, and physical growth. An underlying assumption that teacher behavior is a critical determinant in the learning process led to a concentration on what teachers do to inhibit growth and learning and what teachers can do to encourage learning. A second assumption that self-knowledge is a prerequisite to effective communication and teaching led the class through group exercises directed at introspection and communication. Two education majors were selected to work as paraprofessionals in this course. Their responsibilities included planning and preparing experiences with the instructor, acting as facilitators for group interaction and serving as a model for the students.

During the second year of their training the students became involved in

more sophisticated professional educational courses such as a combined language Arts-Social Studies and a Science-Mathematics block for the elementary grades. The general educational courses studied at this time were Mathematics, Afro-American History and the Foundations of Society. In the Foundations of Society course the student was provided with a perspective of the serious crisis of our urban environment. This purpose was accomplished by providing him with a combined historical, philosophical, social and political perspective on the urban condition. One important facet of this course was its focus on an examination of the power structure of a city.

Another major constituent of this program consisted of supportive services. These services ranged from counseling to the provision of child care, tutoring, homemaker service, team leaders, G.E.D. study sessions, referral to the rehabilitation center, temporary financial aid and instructional materials.

Dr. Edward Barnes has stated that now is the time to view the role of the counselor in terms of needs of people rather than in terms of functions.[5] Therefore, Dr. Barnes suggests Black counselors for Black Students or white counselors who comprehend the problems and needs of Blacks. Indeed Black counselors under the influence of a white society might be as harmful to Black interests as the white counselors are. Dr. Barnes also discusses that a counselor should in some ways be a social worker, as well as a catalyst for social change.

Later in the same paper Dr. Barnes stated: "The need for Black counselors for counseling Black students is indisputable. Black students are better able to relate to and identify with Black counselors. The Black counselor, committed to the Black person's freedom, can help him understand the conflicts between his values and those of the white society. The Black counselor is more likely to use the language which the Black students understand. In general, the Black counselor is much less removed psychologically, sociologically, economically and culturally from his counselees."[6]

Any valid educational model for urban education must include counseling and supportive services that reflect the preceding attitudes. The professional counselor, instructors, and staff must possess an acute awareness of the academic, nonacademic, cultural and personal problems and needs of the urban student. Experience with the Career Opportunities Program at I.U.S.B. has reinforced the idea that counseling cannot be overemphasized. The wide range of academic problems (high school pushout to college dropout) and personal problems (financial problems to marital problems) which had to be dealt with dictated a highly integrated counseling service. Each student's problem was given the fullest consideration and appropriate steps were taken to help him solve his problem.

The Career Opportunities Program at Indiana University at South Bend reflects the understanding of the need for change in educational programs to solve the problems of the Black. Continuing evaluation is being conducted to

[5] Edward J. Barnes, "Counseling and the Black Student: The Need for a New View," *University-Community Educational Programs* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, August, 1970).

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 2.

provide information contributing to ongoing program development. This program is one step toward solving the many problems that Blacks face in urban America.

References

Barnes, Edward J., "Counseling and the Black Student: The Need for a New View," University-Community Educational Programs, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, August, 1970.

Bruner, Jerome, "The Process of Education Revisited," *Phi Delta Kappa,* September, 1971.

Dentler, R. B. Mackler, M. Warshauer, eds. *The Urban R's: Race Relations as the Problem in Urban Education,* New York: Center for Urban Education, 1967.

Dixon, Norman & H. P. Baptiste, Jr., "Black Survival and Black Education," Notre Dame Journal of Education, V-1, No. 2, 1970.

Featherstone, Joseph, "The British and Us," *The New Republic,* September 11, 1971, p. 21.

Silberman, Charles E., *Crisis in the Classroom,* New York: Random House, 1970.

Smith, Donald, "The Black Revolution and Education," R. L. Green, ed. *Racial Crisis in American Education.* Chicago: Follet Educational Corporation, 1969, p. 63.

The Black Scholar, April, 1970, published by the Black World Foundation, San Francisco, California.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead with your statement.

Mr. HIRSCHINGER. Even though I am a graduate of Purdue and we beat Notre Dame quite often, I would not object to that, Congressman Brademas.

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee, I sincerely want to thank you for the opportunity of appearing before you today so that I may share with you some of my feelings as a teacher in a title I program and also the concerns of the teachers and citizens of the State of Indiana.

I do not profess to be an expert on educational funding but I do, as a teacher, a teacher leader and citizen of Indiana, know of the problems that we are currently facing in the educational arena of my State.

And gentlemen, that No. 1 problem is finance. At the present time approximately one-third of our schools in Indiana are at their tax maximums for operating funds. These corporations employ almost one-half the teachers in Indiana who are trying to provide good education for almost one-half of our student population.

Now the question must be raised, "Where are we going to get the moneys needed to maintain our schools and their present educational programs? We ask the local taxpayer—"Can you help?" The answer comes back, "No" because he is already paying the maximum rate allowable by law.

We ask the State legislature to finance public education by a larger percentage than the current 38 percent, and our pleas fall on deaf ears. Gentlemen, I am here today believing that your ears are open, and that you are concerned with providing our students with the types of educational programs that they so drastically need in order to compete equally with all of the citizens of this great country.

We know, as do many others, that the local property tax which is now supporting our schools at over 57 percent has a discriminatory effect on the educational opportunities of our children.

Sure, we have a lawsuit in our courts at this time, hoping to get a judgment similar to the *Serrano* v. *Priest* judgment in California, but the problem isn't one that will be answered by a judge's decision. It is a problem that must be answered legislatively at the State and Federal levels.

We must build a partnership between local, State, and Federal funding of our educational system that is much more equitable than the one we have at present.

In Indiana, in the school year 1970–71, the Federal Government provided approximately $16 million in title I funds. This was a big help for without it one-tenth of our public school population would not have received the special help programs that were provided.

Let me give you some personal experience. In the Lafayette School corporation I teach in a title I program in the summer for 7 weeks. We provide remedial instruction in mathematics and reading. In my area of mathematics, in the summer of 1970, the students showed a 60-percent average gain in knowledge of computational skills.

That is a significant increase and it would not have been achieved had it not been for the title I funding. Our program cost approximately $90,000. That is 9 cents on our local tax rate which we could

not have levied because we are already at our maximum allowable rate.

Therefore, the program could not have been offered. Being on the firing line in the classroom, I have seen these funds produce results that would otherwise have not been possible. So, I urge you to continue to fully fund the title I program and other specific Federal programs such as the NDEA title III and ESEA title III.

The NDEA title III matching funds, which sometimes elude the President's budget, amounted to $1.2 million in Indiana, yet we had requests from local school corporations for over two and a half times that amount in matching funds.

ESEA title III provided funds amounting to slightly over $3 million, yet funded less than one-third of the programs that met all the criteria and evaluation of the administration.

The teachers in Indiana are ready to provide the programs. We need the funds. I see the results of the current funding and I see the need for the continuation of this Federal funding for specific programs such as those I have mentioned, but at a higher level than at present if we are to achieve our goal of equal educational opportunity for all of the youth of our Nation.

Yes, we need further expansion of Federal support beyond the 6½ percent. It needs to be doubled and doubled again and it should be primarily general in nature with specific categorical programs to bolster national priorities not covered by general funds.

Education in Indiana has changed to meet the needs of the children, but we are now at that point where continuation of our progress or, in some cases, the halting of our regression can only be realized by a complete overhauling of our local and State tax structures and, in turn, a realization on the part of Congress that the Federal Government must come to grips with the educational crisis across the Nation by paying its fair share of the bill for quality education.

When it comes to specifics on certain general and categorical aid bills under your consideration, I certainly would recommend to you the testimony of the representatives of the National Education Association for they are truly speaking for the teachers in Indiana as well as the entire country.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM BIANCHI, UNISERV DIRECTOR, SOUTH BEND EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Mr. BIANCHI. Thank you Congressman and members of the committee. I thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak before you.

I work for the teachers of South Bend, Ind., and I want to start off by saying thank you from the over 400 teachers and 10,000 students that are directly aided by Federal projects in our schools.

There are 3,500 students in our school corporation, so we have been able to involve approximately a third of our students in Federal programs. We had a total corporation budget of nearly $32 million last year of which $3 million came from Federal sources.

Our biggest projects are title I and Headstart with a half million apiece and the State has just placed an application with the regional office under title III for approximately $300,000 for aid and instuctional purposes.

79-836—72——11

The teachers in my community see the results from these programs and their immediate effect upon the children they teach. One teacher said to me, "Federal programs are really imperative. They can provide for so much more individualization, library and other special materials as well as counselors and special reading programs."

The teachers have seen help come into their rooms from certified resource teachers to qualified trained paraprofessionals. In fact, many of the teachers in our schools and other schools in our system are now envious of the materials available to a title I teacher and what a turnaround that is.

Another teacher who taught in the innercity schools before title I and is still working there said, "It was like I was swimming with a huge weight around my neck and then had it removed."

Fourteen schools out of the 49 are involved in title I and some of these are also involved in Model City programs and Headstart. My purpose in coming here, however, is not to talk to you so much about what it is now but hopefully to give you recommendations and insights from the teachers themselves, the frontline participants in our efforts to educate our youth.

Teachers are a busy lot. They need time to think as well as time to teach. Talent costs, so my first recommendation is to provide the title I teacher released time in order to permit a greater sharing between teachers of the methods they use and the mutual knowledge to provide for the individual needs of their students.

Second, many of these programs have been in existence for a number of years so it is time to pull these experienced teachers together and provide them with an opportunity to make recommendations as to ways to improve the overall programs to better fulfill the needs of our underprivileged children.

Third, there is a need for supplemental education in both procedures and language to allow for greater participation in the programs. To be able to read and understand one program doesn't necessarily guarantee the understanding of another.

We want the very best for our students and if they qualify for a program, we want to get it for them without having to go through too much redtape.

I understand your reasons for providing incentive-type programs. It was to help get a program started and then have it picked up by a local school corporation after a period of time.

However, it is virtually impossible in my school corporation to find any extra money to meet the sharing requirements. What has happened is that we have let many excellent programs go by, even though they would have helped our students, simply because we did not have the money.

South Bend has been at its maximum taxing limit for the last 5 years, and unless there is a complete revamping of our State tax structure, I can see no improvement in our already tight budget. My fourth recommendation then is to provide more general grants so that when the need is there, the additional dollars can also be there.

The innercity schools and those with a heavy concentration of disadvantaged in my city are, for the most part, the oldest schools in the corporation. In South Bend, the average age of the 14 title I schools is

48 years, with the oldest building being built in 1898, and the newest in 1957. We will close down two of these schools next year and the average will still be 43 years.

Therefore, my fifth recommendation is to provide for an expansion of the Federal guidelines that would allow us to provide for modernization of our plants. Structurally, they are fine but they contain, in most cases, the most depressing interiors. We want our schools to provide a fresh and exciting place to be and not one that is drab and out of date and starts with a strike against learning.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide these recommendations. I can just say that we need help. Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. Assuming that we can write a general Federal aid to education bill this year, how would you suggest that we protect title I?

Mr. BIANCHI. I am not really positive. If we have a fear at this point that if we go in with general aid that we will lose title I——

Chairman PERKINS. From the standpoint of appropriations, how would we protect title I?

Mr. BIANCHI. I think the written-in guarantee in title I that states that these programs are to be based on concentrations of disadvantaged children by itself should be enough. Even though there are still needs, we are not able to fund properly, the ones in the depressed areas are even worse off.

So, to say that we would all of a sudden give everyone $100—that is, $100 a child—we may need $200 for the disadvantaged and title I does do that.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me ask you one additional question. Assuming we write a general Federal aid to education bill, not tied to any value-added tax or sales tax or anything else, that would authorize an expenditure totaling some $10 or $12 billion additional or maybe $15 billion, and then go before the Appropriations Committee and we are only able to get appropriated an additional $2 billion over and above the present educational appropriations, how should we then spend that $2 billion extra?

I think it is reasonable we will get $2 billion extra this year by making the right type of fight before the Appropriations Committee, and I would like to see us go far beyond that figure.

But at that $2 billion level, how should it be expended? I will first call on the gentleman that testified first and get his analysis.

Mr. HIRSCHINGER. If we get into that hypothetical situation—of course, we would like to have a better situation than that. This is a more realistic one perhaps. I would be in favor of continuing to fund the categorical programs as we now are and use this additional money in general funding of education.

Chairman PERKINS. The general funding of present categorical programs?

Mr. HIRSCHINGER. No, not of the present categorical programs. The additional money I would be in favor of spending in general aid to the States for education.

Chairman PERKINS. The $2 billion?

Mr. HIRSCHINGER. Right. It would be a drop in the bucket but it would be a beginning.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Bianchi?

Mr. BIANCHI. I have to concur. I don't want to be afraid to start. If we believe very strongly in the program, let's go. I think we have got to have general aid and we have got to start it and that is the place to start. Two billion is a lot of money to me, but that is certainly a place to begin.

Chairman PERKINS. I am thinking about over and above the present level of funding educational programs.

Mr. HIRSCHINGER. We are certainly concerned with the children who have special problems in our State and throughout the country and see the necessity of the Federal Government stepping in and funding these specific problem areas which we have been doing in the past.

But we are also very much concerned with the overall educational programs for all the students. This is where we need the general aid.

Chairman PERKINS. There is no quarrel about the general aid, but you are the first two witnesses of about 40 or 50 that have stated they would put it into the general aid approach instead of putting it into the present programs if we were limited to $2 billion.

Mr. Ford?

Mr. FORD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was happy to hear your last response because, as a long-time supporter and one of the members of Mr. Perkins' committee, I worked with John Brademas in writing title I in 1965. I am pleased with everything you had to say about it.

But, even when President Nixon talks in terms of $16 billion for education, I haven't seen the color of his money yet. At least he has been floating that kind of a figure around. I am beginning to feel optimistic about the idea that the time may now be upon us where we have to be more ambitious about Federal aid than we have been.

I note that one of you suggested that you would like to see a possible balance for the State of Indiana in financing of one-half State funds, 25 percent local funds, and 25 percent Federal. But then one of you said that $2 billion sounded like a lot of money.

I have a bill in with some 40 cosponsors for general aid that starts off rather modestly with 20 percent of the per pupil expenditure for all children between the ages of 5 and 17, and that one factor costs $10.6 billion the first year.

In addition it would authorize a sum equal to one-third of that, which would be another $3.5 billion to be distributed to those school districts that now receive title I funds. This is the equalizing factor that we have in it.

In addition to that, it specifically authorizes the continuation of the categorical programs of impact aid. While this does not promise that these programs will continue indefinitely, it will insure that they continue until they are replaced.

Finally, there is an additional factor which would provide construction money. This would be a 2-year program based on a program which would count the children who are in larger than acceptable classroom sizes, in inadequate classrooms, in one-room schoolhouses or any classroom where more than one grade has to be taught in the same classroom, and in buildings that are unsafe and antiquated.

One of you mentioned in your testimony that you have some buildings which have existed since 1898. In Detroit I understand they

are still using a junior high school that was dedicated when Theodore Roosevelt was President.

We would try to, in 2 years, give the school districts that have been neglecting their capital improvements because of a lack of funds an opportunity to catch up.

So, we are thinking very seriously about maintaining the categorical programs that we have until such time as we get one-third Federal money. We don't flinch at the idea anymore around here of talking in terms of a $20 billion or $22 billion Federal expenditure for education because we have the sharpest pencils and the tightest spenders in education outdoing us these days in big figures, so we will see how much support they give us.

In your State of Indiana, to what extent is overcrowding measured by what you consider to be optimum teacher-pupil ratios a problem?

Mr. HIRSCHINGER. We are overcrowded to a certain extent but it is not a very serious problem, I don't believe. To the extent where we might be recommending an average class size of 24 to 26, maybe our average class sizes are coming in around 28 or 29, which is not overburdening.

Mr. FORD. In your collective bargaining agreements with schools and education associations, do you have a class size stipulated?

Mr. BIANCHI. Ours does. When we negotiated our first contract 3 years ago class size was 38 and today it is now 32. We still have 25 students per class, but 32 is a tremendous step forward. It really has helped. There isn't a title I school in our corporation now, because of the contract and because of the aid that comes in from title I moneys—we are able to do that where it is close to 32. I think the average is about 26 in our title I schools.

In our contract we specifically state that all schools in the underprivileged title I, with a concentration of underprivileged children, will be maintained below 32 maximum.

Mr. FORD. Do you still have teachers in Indiana teaching in one-room schoolhouses?

Mr. HIRSCHINGER. I don't believe we have any of those remaining in the State. We still have some pretty small school corporations, but over the past few years we have been consolidating and bringing together these smaller units to provide a more adequate educational program.

Mr. FORD. You don't bus the children to that school?

Mr. HIRSCHINGER. We bus them because of where they live, so many miles from school in many instances, and we, of course, are faced with busing problems currently in our capital city of Indianapolis which is under court rule.

Mr. FORD. Are you compelled in Indiana in any of your school districts to have half-day sessions for children?

Mr. HIRSCHINGER. None that I know of.

Mr. FORD. Do you have any children on dual sessions, children and teachers?

Mr. HIRSCHINGER. None that I know of at present, although the first year I taught in Indiana I was under just such a situation.

Mr. FORD. It is unfortunately quite common in my part of Michigan, both half-day sessions and double shifts, where we have a complete

shift of teachers and pupils who use the school for one shift and they are replaced, just like a factory, in the same school building with another shift later in the day.

Mr. BIANCHI. One school corporation in the State of Indiana had to close because of lack of funds, and I think that is the first time that has ever happened in the State of Indiana. I think the legislation has done some things possibly to correct it at this point, but we can see there are problems coming, too.

Mr. FORD. One of you stated that the present ratio of State and local support for the schools is out of bounds. What is the present ratio?

Mr. HIRSCHINGER. The State supports roughly 38 percent, depending on what type of moneys you count; and the local level is picking up somewhere between 57 to 60 percent.

Mr. FORD. Does the State provide any construction money; or is it only operating money?

Mr. HIRSCHINGER. Operating money.

Mr. BIANCHI. Operating, no construction money.

Mr. FORD. All construction comes out of local taxes.

Mr. BIANCHI. A title III grant was given to the corporation there to build an instructional center. Money did come for that. That was about $800,000, but that was totally to put in the center, revamp a floor of the educational center in South Bend.

Mr. FORD. That is a single project, a single grant thing, but you have no regular support coming from any source except local property taxes for school construction.

Mr. BIANCHI. That is correct.

Mr. HIRSCHINGER. This thing would seem to be our problem, because our local tax rate that we are allowed to levy for construction, we don't seem to have any problems there because we are not bound in by a ceiling.

Where we have got the ceiling is on our operating funds. This is the fund where we are on a limit. Over a third of our corporations are at this operating fund tax limit. They can raise additional money to build buildings. We don't seem to have a problem building buildings.

You can travel through the State and see many nice fine new school buildings, but the staff and the programs that are in those buildings are what is suffering.

Mr. FORD. We are all in agreement that the present level of financial support for your schools and those of most of the States, if not all, across the country is inadequate. If we were to ask you, as a representative of Indiana teachers, to give us a list of priorities of where additional money should be spent to meet the needs, would you be able to say that there is any one need that exceeds others enough so that you would take care of that need to the exclusion of others?

Mr. HIRSCHINGER. You are speaking of specific needs now?

Mr. FORD. Let me give you an example. The House has passed a so-called Emergency School Assistance Act as an amendment to the Higher Education Act. That act provides that if a school district is undergoing desegregation, $1 billion should be spent this year on that kind of school district, so this is a priority which has been recognized.

Unfortunately, it is viewed by some of us as a priority that becomes

exclusive in that we are being told that if we have another billion dollars to spend, we should only spend it on this one particular facet of educational need. Nobody on this committee disagrees with the need to assist school districts that are engaged in desegregation activities, but the approach that we have now taken is the most categorical approach we have ever taken on any bill.

It is far more than title I, which extends into 95 percent of the school districts, because the number of school districts within a given State and the number of districts in the country that will qualify for any funds is very limited. This produces a kind of reaction with people who say, "But we have a problem, too."

Would you be willing to hazard a priority that could be dealt with by further categorical approach to the exclusion—not exclusion, but at least while we say to the other problems, "You can wait"?

Mr. BIANCHI. Yes. If I were to put a priority now, it would still be class size, it would still be reducing the number of students per professional person in that classroom. We need help there.

Chairman PERKINS. That is your No. 1 priority?

Mr. BIANCHI. That is my No. 1 priority.

Mr. HIRSCHINGER. I do not believe we have further need, at the present time, for more categorical aid. I think our main concern should be in providing general aid for all the students and not just a few.

Mr. FORD. Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Brademas?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Thank you again, gentlemen. I just have a couple of questions. I don't believe I have heard you comment yet on a tax which President Nixon has said he is asking some of his advisers to take a look at with an eye toward helping elementary and secondary schools, the so-called value-added tax, which the Wall Street Journal and many other similarly radical newspapers have called a national sales tax. What is your attitude toward that?

Mr. HIRSCHINGER. In my opinion, our judgment on the best way to raise money at the Federal level is best left to you people here in Washington who are far more expert on the subject than I am.

We do need to shift some priorities perhaps at the national level. Maybe we do not need to raise as much additional moneys as some people are talking about, but if we shift our priorities toward the goal of education, perhaps some of this money could be found there.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Do you have any comment on that?

Mr. BIANCHI. I really don't understand the value-added tax, but I do know that we need some help from the Federal Government for schools, and I would like to see more money come into that.

But I would agree with Jim that we have to give priority to our needs across this country. Teachers, it seems to me, say we are spending money for a lot of things, and it is not helping these kids at all; and we need that money to come into the school system some way to do that.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I appreciate that response but I hope my constituents will not mind if I offer the observation that you had better get busy and take a look at the issue of the way in which the revenue is raised. I do not think you can expect to ask Congress for more money for schools, and as you both know, I am a strong advocate of that position

as are my colleagues, the distinguished chairman of this committee, Mr. Perkins, and the other distinguished member, Mr. William Ford, without taking a look at the mechanism for getting the money.

What you should understand, in my view, is that what the administration is at least considering is to single out American education, unlike any other kind of service we provide, to have its fate linked to the revenue-raising capacity of a special form of tax which every economist knows is a regressive tax.

You will notice that the military is not singled out by having its budget linked to a particular form of tax. Nor is the Nixon administration considering linking the Pentagon budget to a value added tax. That isn't going to happen around here. Do you understand what I am saying?

Mr. HIRSCHINGER. Yes, I do.

Mr. BRADEMAS. So, if you take the attitude that taxes are supposed to be something that only Congressmen should be experts in, you are going to commit hari kari for American education. I make that observation as your friend, as I think you know.

You are representatives of the NEA of which my mother is a life member. My mother began teaching in a one-room country schoolhouse in Indiana and I also have good friends in the AFT. I hope I do not get myself in too much trouble if I admonish my NEA friends to take a look at the resolution of the AFT on the value added tax because your throats are involved also.

So, Mr. Chairman, with that sermon, I will simply say that here endeth the first lesson.

Mr. HIRSCHINGER. I do understand.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I make this point, Mr. Chairman, because I am terribly concerned that, if we ask for added expenditures on the part of the Federal Government for particular areas that we regard as priorities, we must at the same time give attention to the ways in which we raise the revenues with which to meet those priorities. If we fail to look at the method of raising the revenues, we will be undermining our ability to obtain our priorities.

I don't think my friends from Indiana would quarrel with what I have said. If they do, I hope they will say so.

Mr. HIRSCHINGER. I feel, from what I have heard, maybe you were contradicting yourself a little there. One, you were saying we do not want the additional funds for education to be tied to a value added tax or any specific tax.

Mr. BRADEMAS. That is right, as distinguished from obtaining the funds from the general treasury, based chiefly on the progressive income tax.

Mr. HIRSCHINGER. I understand your last remarks as being to look where the money is coming from and to tell you people where it should come from.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I don't regard that as contradictory because, if you come in here and say to us, we want more money for schools but we really don't care if you get the money from the value added tax or the progressive income tax, the result of that attitude is going to be you are not going to get any more money for schools.

Mr. HIRSCHINGER. I understand that. I am sorry that I gave the impression that I was leaving that much to you. I know the results of having schools and educational funds tied to specific taxes. We see that at the State level.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Of course.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I would like to yield to Mr. Ford, if I may, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FORD. I would like to just make another observation. If the other panel is here I hope they will take note of it too. In trying to figure out all the things that have been floated around this country and this town about this $16 billion package of the value added tax that is going to do magical things for the schools, one thing that is fairly constant is the assertion that this would be at a cost of $16 billion.

Then we started figuring what is tied into it. For example, it is suggested that part of the cost of the $16 billion that would be asked of the value added taxes collected in order to relieve people from its regressiveness, would enable them to deduct from their income tax the amount of money paid in the value added tax or the approximation thereof, just as now, if you file a long form you can deduct sales tax.

So, some portion of the $16 billion is going to be paid back, in effect, to the taxpayers by this tax deduction. It is not going to go to schools.

The second factor is, the President has indicated that there will be relief in this package for local taxpayers from the present overburdensome rate of taxation. That is a cost that is going to come out of the $16 billion. It is going to be refunded in some fashion to local taxpayers and that is not going to be new dollars for you to spend in the schools.

Then the third aspect is a very frank commitment by the administration to the nonpublic schools that they are going to have something which we are told probably will take the form of tax credits, where a parent who pays tuition for a child to go to a nonpublic school will be able to claim, on his income tax again, as a credit, some part or all of that tuition. That is going to be a part of the cost of the $16 billion that is not going to find its way into your public schools.

What John, I think, is articulating is the concern that many of us have that we don't detect on your part as advocates for greater support for more dollars for schools, the kind of anxiety that we feel you ought to have at this point for a scheme that is going to juggle $16 billion and perhaps end up with little or nothing in the way of new revenues for schools.

If we simply replace the money you are now getting from local taxpayers with Federal dollars, we haven't done anything to advance the present level of support and, if we take money from a taxpayer with one hand and give it back to him in another, it isn't going to go through your schools to get to him.

And it is distressing that when we look at the testimony that is coming in, nobody speaking as advocates for greater support for edu-

cation is addressing himself to the fact that we are in the middle of a big sales campaign that is about to have educational legislation in this country written by the taxing committees in the Congress instead of the Education Committee, and you fellows ought to be as concerned as we are, and I am not picking on you individually. I am speaking of the broad spectrum of professionals who are most directly concerned with the quality of education in this country and to the extent that you can sound the alarm.

This is the time. It is upon us.

Mr. HIRSCHINGER. We certainly appreciate your remarks and will keep them in mind.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you, gentlemen, very much.

Mr. Carl Megel is our next witness.

(Mr. Megel's prepared statement follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT BY CARL J. MEGEL, AFL–CIO AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: My name is Carl J. Mengel; I am the Legislative Director of the American Federation of Teachers, a national organization affiliated with the AFL–CIO and consisting of more than 250,000 classroom teachers.

With me this morning is Greg Humphrey, our Assistant Director.

The American Federation of Teachers is pleased to again have the opportunity to appeal before the Committee in behalf of increasing Federal support for elementary and secondary education. In previous presentations before this Committee, we pointed out that outdated text books were being used in overcrowded classrooms crammed into antiquated structures too poorly equipped to meet modern day needs. Overworked and underpaid school teachers struggle to maintain professional dignity in classrooms without books, paper, pencils, and sometimes without blackboard chalk.

Many of these teachers forget their own personal financial difficulties in their efforts to teach hungry and poorly clothed youngsters.

No single factor created these conditions. They stemmed from the ever-expanding, ever-shifting, school population accelerated by school planning which often lacks imagination and resourcefulness. Regardless of any other cause, the deficiencies and deterioration are due to lack of funds. Lack of funds are due essentially:

1. Upon antiquated tax structures which placed major education dependency upon local property tax and
2. Lack of supplementary federal funds.

I am well aware that recitation of educational needs must sound to the members of this committee like a broken record. However, the facts of the matter are that the financial situations have actually deteriorated, particularly in our larger city school systems which enroll a large percentage of our elementary and secondary boys and girls. This deterioration is due among others to:

1. The rising cost of education and
2. The declining percentage of federal funds in support of public education.

As a result, many school districts in 1972 must reduce their school term, curtail school services, and increase class size by not hiring or replacing teachers who retire or leave the system. Other systems are maintaining a semblance of structure through deficit financing which cannot continue indefinitely.

Detroit, Chicago, Philadelphia, and New York schools pass from crisis to crisis almost daily, as do the great majority of the 16,000 school districts throughout the nation.

To alleviate these conditions, the American Federation of Teachers strongly supports H.R. 981 introduced by Congressman Carl Perkins. H.R. 981 is a bill to establish a national program of assistance to the states and is cited as the "Nationwide Educational Excellence Act." The goal of this Act is to assure an average total of $1,600 for the education of each child in every school district in the nation. This is the major feature of this legislation.

By setting a proper expenditure standard of funds for each child, H.R. 981 has a trade mark which differentiates it from any other education bill.

The following table prepared from figures recently released by the U.S. Department of Commerce for the calendar year 1970 shows:

FACTS AND FIGURES

SCHOOL-AGE POPULATION—1970

Age 5–17—Percentage of total population—26.1 percent.
Average daily attendance (K–12)—40,562,000 pupils.
Total teachers, including librarian and nonsupervisory staff—2,050,000.

EXPENDITURES—1970

Total	$38,476,000,000
Federal	2,545,000,000
State	15,645,000,000
Local	20,286,000,000
Average per pupil	783

PROPOSAL

H.R. 981 proposal—$1,600 per year per pupil.
Requires an increase of—$26,000,000,000.[1]
AFT 5-year program of—$5,200,000,000 per year.

H.R. 981 proposes a ten year funding program. However, since we are already several years behind the enactment of this legislation and because of the great urgency of need, the AFT is proposing that the program become a five year program which would require an additional federal outlay of slightly more than $5 billion per year, in order to attain a total federal expenditure of $26 billion per year in five years. It is our contention, that the Federal Government should and must provide at least ⅓ of the cost of education in our nation. If this were done, the following benefits would accrue:

1. Increase teacher average salary by $3,000.
2. Increase the teaching staff by 500,000 teachers.
3. Increase the number of classrooms by 600,000.
4. Reduce class size to an average—20 pupils per teacher—actual.[2]
5. Provide one para-professional for every two teachers.

We would also ask that H.R. 981 be amended by the insertion of the following paragraph:

"The Commissioner shall not approve an application by a State for funds under this act unless there is satisfactory assurance that such funds will be allocated among the local educational agencies within that State according to the educational need in such a manner that, when added to the State's basic averge per pupil expenditure, there will be, to the extent feasible, approximately equal socially compensatory levels in the average per pupil expenditure throughout all areas of the State."

In our efforts to achieve nationwide education excellence, we give special consideration to the millions who remain either illiterate or relatively uneducated. These millions constitute that portion of our population which is labeled as "the poor and the deprived."

The proposition is no longer open to challenge that in our society there exists a close association between inadequate education and subsequent poverty and deprivation. David Selden, President of the AFT in a scholarly testimony entitled "Money and the Marginal Child" has expertly outlined the AFT's provision. I should like to enter this statement in the record at this point.

At every level (local, state and national) the question of financing of educational systems poses problems. The Serrano decision in California, erasing local property taxes, for financing local educational systems, have been followed by similar decisions in other areas. If fully implemented, the Serrano decision means that increasing state and federal funds must be allocated to replace the

[1] $1,600 × 40,000,000 = $64,000,000,000; 1970 Expenditure—$38,000,000,000; Need—$26,000,000,000.
[2] Most averages now include many nonteacher employees—librarians, counselors, and so forth.

1970

loss of local property tax. Accordingly, we will of necessity move into state education systems.

It must be remembered, however, that the Serrano decision did not outlaw property tax. The decision stated that local property tax could not provide equalized educational opportunity. States, therefore, must set up systems of statewide property taxation and distribute the funds for education on equalized basis so that every child will have a fair and equal chance to receive quality education.

At the national level, there have been Administration proposals for "Revenue Sharing" and "Value Added Tax" to support education. The AFT cannot support revenue sharing unless massive new funds are provided. The following resolution on the value added tax passed by the AFT Executive Council states our position clearly:

AFT Opposes Value Added Tax

The American Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO, strongly opposes the Nixon Administration's proposed value-added tax. We resent the attempt to tie education to a regressive, unfair method of taxation which would further advance the Nixon "soak the poor" philosophy.

The value-added tax is not a new of taxing—it is merely a different method of collecting a sales tax. The burden of a value-added tax falls entirely on the consumer, with all the regressive attributes of a sales tax. Moreover, the value-added tax would destroy the thin margin of equity that remains in the Federal tax structure.

As proposed this tax would single out education for special treatment. Revenue for education should be raised in the same manner that funds are raised for other social programs thru the existing progressive Federal tax structure. It is inappropriate to hide an unfair tax under the cloak of desperately needed educational funds.

The AFT will oppose any value-added tax proposed in Congress and will participate in the campaigns mounted against the value-added tax by the AFL–CIO and other segments of the labor movement.

Approved by the AFT Executive Council, February 5, 1972.

An extremely volatile issue is that of school busing. At the AFL–CIO Executive Council meeting on February 15 the following statement was issued:

Statement by the AFL–CIO Executive Council on School Busing

Bal Harbour, Fla., February 15, 1972

The AFL–CIO has consistently supported both quality education and integrated education. We have just as staunchly supported mass investment of federal funds to improve substandard schools. We have fought for legislation to achieve open housing as the most effective way to achieve integrated education.

The AFL–CIO Executive Council categorically reiterates these positions and adds:

1. We wholeheartedly support busing of children when it will improve the educational opportunities of the children.

2. We deplore the actions of those individuals or groups who are creating a divisive political issue out of America's vital need for quality, integrated education.

3. We will oppose the Constitutional amendment approach because it will do a disservice to the quality, integrated education which we support.

The AFT supports this provision without reservations.

In conclusion Mr. Chairman—Without massive federal input, American education in the great majority of our school districts face chaos and bankruptcy. We firmly believe that the Congress must immediately face up to the dire needs of the nation's schools.

The proliferation of federal educational funding programs can be merged into H.R. 981 if fully funded. We urge serious consideration for this provision. We extend our thanks to the Chairman and the Committee for the opportunity to present our points of view.

STATEMENT OF CARL MEGEL, LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

Mr. MEGEL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Having lived in the Congressman's district in Illinois for many years and in close proximity to Michigan, I certainly appreciate the things we heard here from all these areas so close to my home.

I am just going to give you a résumé. You have my presentation, and I think a recitation of our needs is probably useless at this time, except that I do want to say that in the cities of Detroit, Chicago, Philadelphia, and New York, they pass from crisis to crisis almost daily.

New York needs at least $850 million for operating. Chicago has had to reduce its staff and its services. They have got to have some money. Cleveland is far behind.

We are supporting H.R. 981, and this is no reflection on any other legislation introduced by Congressman Pucinski, Congressman Ford, or anyone else. We believe this is the whole program and the whole bill to provide $1,600 for every boy and girl in the State.

To do this would require about $5 billion a year for the next 5 or 6 years. We could do that. If we do this, we could increase teachers' salaries by $3,000. We could increase the teaching staff by a half million. We could increase the number of classes by 600,000, and we could bring the class size down to 20 pupils, and we could provide a paraprofessional for every two teachers.

We would ask that an amendment be inserted in H.R. 981:

> The Commissioner shall not approve an application by a State for funds under this act unless there is satisfactory assurance that such funds will be allocated among the local educational agencies within that State according to the eductional need in such a manner that, when added to the State's basic average per pupil expenditure, there will be, to the extent feasible, approximately equal socially compensatory levels in the average per pupil expenditure throughout all areas of the State.

The proposition is no longer open to challenge. It is time that we do something. I want to, at this time, also insert in the record the fine statement by our president, David Selden, "Money and the Marginal Child."

Mr. FORD. Without objection, the prepared statement of Mr. Carl Megel will be inserted in the record preceding the remarks you just made; and without any other objection, the document, "Money and the Marginal Child," will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The document referred to follows:)

MONEY AND THE MARGINAL CHILD

(By David Selden)

> The insidious influence of the laws of economics on educational theory and tactics is little understood and seldom acknowledged. Yet this relationship is fundamental to any discussion of the quality of education. Money does not educate children; teachers and other educational workers do. Spending money on education will not in itself guarantee that children will be educated, but it is certain that children cannot be educated without it.
>
> If we accept graduation from high school as the minimum definition of what constitutes "an education," American schools, even by their own standards,

educate only half the children of the nation. Half of those who enter first grade never make it through the twelfth. Somewhere along the line they become dropouts, failouts, or pushouts. The idea that half our children are not worth educating seems monstrous and yet, this is exactly the effect of what we are now doing. In effect, our school systems are based upon the concept of the "marginal child."

In economics, the marginal product is that which is barely worth producing. The marginal child is that child who, in the judgment of our society, is just barely worth the cost of educating. Those who fall below that line—the submarginal ones—are rejected or discarded in exactly the same way submarginal products are thrust out of the marketplace—except that humans unlike submarginal automobiles, soap, or breakfast foods, do not just disappear; they become a part of our unemployment welfare, crime, and riot statistics.

There are those who insist that the amount of money spent on educating a child has little or no bearing on whether or not the child learns. This is nonsense. The effectiveness of teaching depends on a number of factors, all or almost all of which are controlled by the laws of economics.

There are differences in the educability of children. There are differences in intelligence, for instance. While intelligence tests may not be reliable as fine-scale measurements of the learning potential of a particular child, they nevertheless give adequate information about gross differences in intelligence, and these differences do affect the educability of children. Some children are emotionally unstable or psychologically handicapped so that they are unable to function in a group setting without special attention being given to them. Hundreds of thousands of children are socially and environmentally handicapped. Even when the problem of cultural relevance of curriculum and materials is properly dealt with so that such children at least understand the references in textbooks and other materials, they still have greater difficulty in learning than do children coming from more amenable environments.

The fact that some children will be able to escape the statistical predictions of success and failure which could be made for their profile group, does not alter the fact that we are confronted with a massive problem, and only a solution which takes this into account has any validity. If we are going to reform our educational system so that, instead of educating 50% of our children, we educate 75% or even 90%, tremendous amounts of additional money will be necessary. Even considering that the most effective and efficient methods are used, educating another 25% of our children will require a vast expansion of educational services, and it is obvious that the amount of money per child will increase as we go down the range of educability. That is, the farther we get away from the typical child for which our schools are designed, the more it will cost.

We have been educating the easier-to-educate and rejecting the others. The easier-to-educate are those who can adapt to large group routinized instruction. Children with special learning problems require extra service—small-group or remedial instruction, psychological help, medical service, or just tender, loving care. Such services are squeezed out by the economic crunch within which our schools must operate.

The liberal Benthamite principle of "the greatest good for the greatest number" becomes a cruel engine of destruction when applied to a school system with less than half enough money to do the job assigned to it. Under present conditions, a kid who needs twice as much attention as another will be pushed aside, because if we educate him, we are denying an education to two other, easier-to-educate children.

The following are some ways in which economic factors control what goes on in American schools:

1. According to the "Coleman Report," the most important single factor in a child's learning experience is his social milieu. Children from lower socio-economic groups, when mixed in school with middle and upper middle class children, learn better without handicapping the learning of the other more favored children. Because of the segregated housing patterns, particularly in the northern big cities, the only way such a social mix can be achieved is by busing. Busing is expensive, both in capital outlay and operating costs, but if schools are not integrated, even larger amounts of money will be required for compensatory education programs. We therefore reject as immoral the policy of the Nixon administration which would restrict the amount of federal aid funds available for compensatory education programs and at the same time prohibit use of federal funds for busing.

2. Shortages of funds inevitably force large-group instruction. Larger classes can be taught by a teacher if the children in the class are all of approximately the same learning ability. The teacher can then use mass methods of instruction. The basic effect of ability grouping, however, is to adapt the school to the learning rate of the child instead of intensifying the child's educational experience so that he learns at a faster rate. Consequently, the children in the slower groups spend more and more time learning less and less. The opposite of ability grouping is heterogeneous grouping, but much smaller classes are required to teach varied ability groups. When children of greatly varying learning ability are placed in the same class much more individual attention from the teacher or other educational worker is required. Small classes inevitably require more teachers and other staff—unless the amount of classroom time for the child is reduced, in which case his learning would again be handicapped. The more favorable the staffing ratio the more the cost per child.

3. In addition to the cost factor described above, ability grouping raises a problem of racial discrimination. Socioeconomic class is highly correlated with race, and since learning rates are highly correlated with socioeconomic class, ability grouping results in segregating large numbers of black and other minority children in the slower learning groups.

4. Staffing ratios have a controlling effect on the organization of instruction within the school. In addition to the problem of ability versus heterogeneous grouping there are also many other choices of methods and tactics available to educators. Most of these choices such as team teaching, differentiated staffing, and modular programming require more favorable staffing ratios. When money is tight there is no leeway in staff assignments and the more innovative and creative approaches to education are ruled out in favor of the "tried and true" methods of the past.

5. Economic factors have a hidden effect on curriculum offerings, particularly at the secondary school level. When small group instruction is squeezed out of the curriculum some of the more advanced courses in math, science, vocational and technical education, and fine arts are offered much less often, if at all. For instance, analytical geometry may be offered only once every other year instead of every year. If a student cannot fit the course into his program in the year it is offered, he is just out of luck.

6. The quantity and quality of instructional materials and equipment is restricted when the supply of money is restricted. For instance, at the later elementary and intermediate levels, computer-assisted instruction has proved particularly useful for remedial teaching. But computers are expensive. Children cannot receive the benefits of such instruction if the school district does not have the money to buy or rent the machines.

7. School systems which have favorable salary schedules, fringe benefits, and working conditions can be more selective in teacher hiring and can have greater flexibility in the choice of methods, techniques, programs and structures. Good teachers can make otherwise ineffective teaching strategies successful, while poor teachers are apt to be less productive even though they may be going through the correct motions in a favorable setting. Acknowledging that there are differences in the effectiveness of teachers does not justify the so-called merit pay schemes, however. Even assuming that we could agree on the degree of effectiveness of one teacher as compared with another, paying them differently would not do anything to change their relative productivity, but being able to hire better qualified and more promising teachers in the first place is a different matter. Those school systems who can attract more effective teachers will inevitably be more productive—quantitatively and qualitatively. Their students will receive better educational service as a direct result of the money spent by the district on its schools.

It is totally irresponsible to say that until we can find a way to educate children more effectively and cheaply, no more money can be spent on education. No one denies that we need more research in education. No one can deny that children should be educated in the most effective and efficient way possible, but until we find more efficient and effective ways to do the job we have the moral responsibility to give our schools the money necessary to educate children on the basis of what we now know.

We now turn to the question of where the money is to come from and how it is to be translated into educational services and how those services are to be distributed.

In talking about improving the financing of education, one must make the basic assumption that a much greater percentage of our gross national income must be devoted to this purpose. As a matter of fact, the United States ranks very low among the developed nations of the world in the percentage of national income given to education.

In 1970 the United States spent slightly under 6% of aggregate income for elementary and secondary school education. England spent 8% and the percentage of income spent by other countries varied upward. It would not be at all unreasonable for the United States to spend 10% of its gross national income for the education of the young. This would increase the total amount spent for elementary and secondary school education to 10% of $795 billion, or $79.5 billion, using 1970 figures. In that year the United States actually spent $45.4 billion for elementary and secondary education, both public and private, with the Federal government contributing approximately 8% of that total: about $4 billion.

In other words, in order to make even this modest additional commitment, $35 billion per year more would have to be produced from somewhere. The question is: where?

In addition to raising enough money to provide intensive education for the children who need it most, a fair and equitable educational support program must require an equitable contribution from all taxpayers.

Our basic ideas were contained in the National Excellence in Education Act introduced in the Senate two years ago, sponsored by many members of this committee. Our plan will be amended in the light of the Serrano decision which outlaws locally levied property taxes for education, and we will ask the sponsors to reintroduce it in the next session of Congress. The plan, as amended, would have the following basic elements:

1. The average per-pupil cost of education, utilizing proper staffing ratios, would be pegged at $1,600 a year.

2. This amount would be achieved by a combination of Federal aid and state tax effort, since the locally levied property tax is no longer a reliable source of income.

3. Each state would establish a state education fund. We make the following suggestions for raising the state share of this fund:

(a) Each state would levy a 20-mill property tax based on state property assessing procedures audited by an agency to be set up within the U.S. Treasury Department.

(b) States would be permitted to levy an education surtax on the Federal income tax. The surtax would be paid to the Treasury Department by the taxpayer along with his U.S. income tax bill. The Treasury Department would then refund such revenue to the state educational fund.

(c) Each state would be required to raise from sources other than the 20-mill property tax a minimum additional amount which would vary with the state's taxable wealth and income.

4. Federal aid would be distributed to the states so as to make up the difference between the amounts raised by state effort and $1,600 per child.

5. States would be required to present to the United States Office of Education a plan for distribution of educational funds to local districts in accordance with the educational need of the district. Educational need would be determined by means of a sociological index which would take into account such factors as per capita income, student mobility, student involvement in court proceedings, and other factors.

6. Local districts would be required to certify acceptable plans to their state agencies, with copies to the United States Office of Education, describing programs for intensive education for hard-to-educate children.

7. Local districts would be required to comply with Federal laws and court decisions relating to integration and civil rights.

In summary, we have tried to show here (1) that the quality of education is directly related to the funds devoted to education; (2) differences in the educability of children must be taken into account in any system of education, so that those with the greatest need receive the most intensive service; (3) equalization of expenditures between states should be accomplished through a combination of required statewide tax effort and Federal aid; an (4) funds must be distributed within states in accordance with educational need.

Mr. MEGEL. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I have with me Leonard Humphrey, who is our assistant director and has given me a lot of help. He will be here if you have any questions.

I want to speak here of the *Serrano* decision in California. What is happening and what hasn't been said here is the only taxes in the neighborhood that can be voted on are school taxes. That is why we have ceilings.

The point that has not been made is that the *Serrano* decision did not outlaw the property tax. Therefore, the State legislature can provide for property taxes and provide funds.

The reason the *Serrano* decision was made, and it was thought of as unequal, is exactly what we have been saying for so many years: a local community cannot finance education on a property tax level and needs State and Federal funds. But those have not been coming.

Therefore, they did develop an unequal distribution of State funds for education. In the wealthier districts they had money. In the poor districts they didn't. But the State and Federal governments should have supplied that money and there would never have been a need for a *Serrano* decision.

A minute ago you talked about the value-added tax. Congressman Brademas mentioned the value-added tax resolution which we wrote about on February 5. You will find that text on page 9 of my statement. I am not going to read it, but it does give our position clearly that we are opposed to the value added tax as an unfair or unjust glorified sales tax which places the emphasis on the poor and the consumer and also singles out education as a special agency through which funds can be raised.

This was also said a minute ago, but we have all that in our resolution. Then again, there is a volatile issue on busing. We have had, in the last couple of years, a lot of things, all issues that cloud the issue and prevent people from supporting funds for education in the manner they should.

The executive council of the AFL–CIO issued a statement on busing which clearly states their position. It is found on page 10 of my report.

Mr. Chairman, I won't take any more time. I want to say, though, that American education in the great majority of our school districts faces chaos and bankruptcy unless we get massive input of funds from the Federal Government. Proliferation of Federal educationally funded programs can be merged into H.R. 981 if fully funded.

We urge serious consideration for this provision. Our thanks to Chairman Perkins and our thanks to you, Congressman Ford, and the rest of the members of the committee.

Mr. FORD. I am very happy to see you have Mr. Humphrey with you. We have had the pleasure of having him visit several times and meet with us when we had common interests.

Of course, I am disappointed you didn't come here with a ringing endorsement of my bill because pride of authorship indicates to me that it is obviously the best of all that have been suggested.

But really, what we are hoping for is to get a consensus developed behind the idea that the time is now for massive Federal assistance and that it should be general in its scope. One concern I have with

79-836—72——12

your approach is the statement at the bottom of page 7 where you discuss the impact of the *Serrano* decision and conclude with the sentence, "Accordingly, we will of necessity move into State education systems."

I fervently hope that you are wrong, but I discussed it with lawyers who participated. I might incidentally indicate to you that we have a number of the California lawyers coming before the committee, I believe next Monday. You might find their discussion and discourse on what Serrano did or didn't do interesting.

But I don't understand that it would require of any State administration merely that there be a distribution scheme that would separate the collection of taxes from the present system that says they must be distributed where collected and put them into a system that says they will be distributed on the basis of the relative needs of children for education rather than their status as residents.

Mr. MEGEL. We have no disagreement with that. I think that my statement says, in the previous sentence, "If fully implemented." If the *Serrano* decision were fully implemented then we would go ahead to State educational assistance, but you are correct in what you have stated and this is a possibility.

Mr. FORD. For any general aid program to work, it has to have at least two fundamental virtues and one of them is that it has to be simple and workable and, from my own bias, it should eliminate any bureaucratic discretion with respect to who gets the money.

School people also know the instant that Congress has appropriated the funds precisely how many dollars that means for their individual districts, whether it is county, State or local, depending on patterns in the various parts of the country.

We have discovered that in those programs such as Impact Aid, for example, where the moment the appropriation is adopted, the individual school districts that qualify for that assistance can mathematically compute their share and begin immediately making specific plans that they have a great deal more opportunity for efficiently using the funds.

They get first shot at teachers, for example, if that is what the funds represent.

Mr. MEGEL. Sometimes it is difficult in local teachers unions to always get those—We can get the allocation but to know exactly what the school board is going to do with it, we can't always know for sure.

Mr. FORD. But that is the only Federal program where you know what the allocation is as soon as Congress acts.

Mr. MEGEL. That is right.

Mr. FORD. In title I you have only a rough idea. The only reason you have some idea in recent years is that we end up appropriating the same amount as we did before and presumably it is going to go in the same directions. But if we were to add money to title I there would be a great gap between the time that Congress acts and the time the individual school districts would know how much of it they were going to get.

That is because it has to go through the State capitol. It goes through two layers of bureaucracy where decisions are made that affect distribution. The State affects the dollar distribution because of

the rules it sets up for distribution within the counties. Then when you get over to the grant programs you have no idea what Federal funds mean.

Mr. MEGEL. You are right. That is why we want to insert the amendment I read to you on page 6, because that takes care of it. The States must therefore make sure that there is equal distribution according to need. That is our need formula, and that is absolutely necessary. By the way, what you mentioned does happen.

Mr. FORD. Except that every State capitol has an annual or semiannual battle over what they call various deductible millage formulas or whatever they capitalize their State distribution of funds to be, and school people are conditioned to just make their pilgrimage on the capitol every year and fight the very special interests of one type of district versus another: urban versus suburban and so on.

Every year they go through this as a regular exercise. I know of no State where it isn't necessary for school people to visit their legislature on that kind of a regular basis to assure the best they can get in terms of their treatment.

For that reason, I detect among school administrators across the country, a great deal of suspicion toward plans that let the State distribute additional funds as distinguished from plans that distribute funds to the most local school financing unit.

Mr. MEGEL. AFT has always worked categorically in relation to flat grants.

Mr. FORD. What I am suggesting is that at this point you are getting into the middle of a classic political conflict that is going to have to be resolved before we pass a general aid bill, and that is the conflict between the Governors and State legislators who want us to send the money as the President's revenue-sharing bill does to the State capitol and let them pass it out, or the position taken by the National School Boards Association, the American Association of School Administrators and those who are at the more local level that they would like the formula to distribute the money directly to them without the intervention of the State capitol.

At some stage, as we have had to on every single program, we will have to decide who is going to have clout. So far, it has been a standoff. In some programs we have bypassed the State capitol and in some programs, political pressure has been so great that we couldn't.

I would suggest to you that you take a look at our experience with programs that were blocked together by the Green amendment a few years ago and turned over to the States and you will notice strange things, that ever since they were blocked together at the insistance of the party of the President, his budget has suggested zero dollars or vast reductions in the amount of money to support those programs as soon as they were turned over to the State.

He has come up with three consistent budgets now that form main portions of the former programs as suggested at zero dollars. This year, at least, he came up with a little bit of money.

What happens if we throw money into the pot in that fashion? I just hope that in your attempt to strengthen Mr. Perkins' approach you are not endorsing one side or another in that conflict between local school districts and State capitols.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We aren't endorsing either side, but take the example of a bill that we were very much interested in and supported and had great hopes for and see what happened to that bill as it became administered on the State level, one need look really at the Emergency Employment Act and find out the types of manipulations that were engaged in on State levels.

The intent of the Congress was frustrated essentially by the way the guidelines were drawn up by the Labor Department and teachers who were specifically included in this bill to be eligible for jobs were, in many cases, completely ignored and were ignored in many cases simply because they didn't have muscle on the State level to move in and grab a share, if the money were so distributed.

We, in general, oppose State programs as such. We did when the Comprehensive Child Development bill came out and that question was raised. We kind of favor sympathetically those programs that will get the money with sufficient safeguards to the level where they can be used most efficiently.

Therefore, we have opposed the President's revenue sharing program for education and his general revenue sharing program simply because we feel the needs would not be safeguarded under this concept.

Mr. FORD. I thank you very much for that clarification because that is the position those of us who have had the pleasure of working with the American Federation of Teachers for a good many years would expect you would be taking because it reflects a great deal of enlightenment. I happen to agree with it, so that makes it even better.

I am pleased also to see that you do come here as advocates of greater support for Federal aid to education and, at the same time, make very clear your position in opposition to the value added tax which many of us believe is a smokescreen to do a lot of things other than support schools.

It could be the greatest political gimmick in the world. It is intended to be a lot of things to a lot of people and after it goes into effect and after the November elections are over I am afraid school people will wake up and discover that they still aren't going to have enough money to finish out the school year.

I think that we are in danger of having education used as the front for a massive tax redistribution program that has great political attraction. Even the people that are going to pay the most under this somehow are strangely attracted to it in preference to the graduated income tax.

Mr. MEGEL. A hidden tax. They don't see it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it is also important to put into the record at this point—my figures may be slightly incorrect, but the President was talking about a loan or a tax deduction for those moneys paid in value added taxes. Mr. Brademas mentioned it earlier. If you do this you are, in fact, taking money out of the general revenues.

The average consumer, I think, would pay between $150 and $200 each year under the value added system, somewhere in that area and if one is allowed to deduct that, $100 in tax deduction equals about $1 billion or possibly $1.5 billion from the general revenues.

Each individual tax deduction of $100 is the equivalent of $1.5 billion of loss to the general revenues.

Mr. FORD. As a matter of fact, when we attempted to increase the personal exemption we were told by the Ways and Means Committee that it costs almost $2 billion for each $100 of increased personal exemption, so $1.5 billion is not too far out of line, so there would not be a correlation between the number of people and the payment of this type of tax.

Mr. Meeds of Washington.

Mr. MEEDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am sorry I was late, Mr. Megel, and didn't get to hear your testimony. I would just add that it seems to me it would at least double the inequity if there were a deduction from the income tax of value added taxes paid. The people who pay the most would get the most back, which would further deplete that source which is, in effect, probably, though none of us like it, the fairest method of taxation.

Mr. MEGEL. That is right.

Mr. FORD. Thank you very much, and thank you on behalf of the committee for the constant and aggressive support that you and your organization have given to the efforts of this committee in passing and funding educational legislation for many, many years.

Mr. MEGEL. We want to thank the committee.

Mr. FORD. At this point, I would like to insert in the record the statement of Claude Purvis, president of the Kentucky Education Association.

The committee is adjourned.

STATEMENT BY CLAUDE PURVIS, PRESIDENT, KENTUCKY EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, LOUISVILLE, KY.

Esteemed Committee members, might I say that we in Kentucky are very proud of your Chairman and our Congressman, Mr. Carl Perkins, for his excellent work on behalf of the school children in our state and across the country. I am deeply grateful for his invitation to appear here today on behalf of the thirty thousand members of the Kentucky Education Association and to present some views on the operation of federal support programs for elementary and secondary education and the future direction of federal support.

Because I am not specifically familiar with these programs as they are currently operated and since a hearing under the auspices of this Committee was held in Lexington, Kentucky, on January 14, at which time Kentucky Department of Education and local school district officials testified at length, I would prefer not to elaborate much on the current operation of the program, except to say that:

1. School officials and personnel in Kentucky seem to be quite pleased with the strengthened and expanded services which are made possible by these programs. Those I have heard praised most often have been the compensatory, vocational, and impacted aid programs.

2. I have not heard a single school official say that the children in his district would be better off without the federal support programs, or even as well off. On the contrary, there appears to be a heavy reliance on providing educational programs federally supported which districts had previously been unable to offer.

3. The primary complaint seems to have been that funding of the programs has lagged far behind the authorization and that final amounts have been calculated late and tend to frustrate planning and implementation, and the insufficient level of federal funding generally.

With your indulgence, I would like to address the remainder of my remarks to what we believe needs to be the future direction of federal support of elementary and secondary education.

We support the continuation of existing federally funded specific or categorical programs because at least at the present time they give greater assurance of delivery of services to children having the most severe educational needs and relief to districts having high concentrations of federal residents and work. We

strongly urge that presently authorized programs be given sufficient permanency so that school officials can plan with greater assurance and that the authorization be fully funded so that specific needs of the children they are designed to meet can be met.

We urge full funding of these authorized programs for two other important reasons:

1. In a real sense, their authorization represents a promise at the federal level to provide badly needed programs to children and it is bitterly frustrating when the promise is not fulfilled by funding; and

2. The general public seems to learn more often through the media of a substantially higher authorization for education programs than the actual level of funding, leaving the mistaken impression that much more is being expended than actually is.

Additionally, we are firmly convinced that the Congress and President should take steps to provide from the federal level approximately one fourth to one third of the total cost of elementary and secondary education. Increasingly, the federal government has recognized the importance of educational opportunities for all of our citizens, and has expanded its role in that regard. It is past time, at the federal level, that we recognize by fiscal act and deed that the interest and security of our society require an enlightened and well-educated citizenry and that the federal government must pay its share of the cost of adequate school programs.

As citizens in any part of the country and from any segment of society, we already pay by way of federal taxes and federal expenditures for the inability and/or failure of states to provide adequate education programs. Better that a substantial portion of the cost be provided from the federal level in the first place and infinitely better for the individual recipient of a sound education made possible by significant federal participation. Another important reason that the Congress and President should take steps to provide approximately one fourth to one third from the federal level for the total cost of education is that the low income states such as Kentucky simply do not have the resources to pay for the kind of school programs our youth need if they are to successfully compete with the youth of higher income states. For years, Kentucky has been near the bottom among states in the amount of money spent for school programs per child and in the most recent years, we have dropped closer to the bottom.

It is true that Kentucky could do some more based on our ability as related to income. To that extent, it represents our failure. But to a substantial degree, our low level of expenditure per child reflects a lack of resources within the state. To that extent, it represents our inability and conceivably the absence of a significant federal general support program.

Recently, the higher courts of two states have given rulings which some interpret as at least a severe frown on the wide disequalization of resources behind education programs within the states. We submit that there is also a wide disequalization of resources among the states and that the provision of a large share of the basic cost of elementary and secondary education programs that would somehow be distributed in a manner that took into account the ability level of the states would tend to correct this disequalization. We would suggest that precautions be taken so that states would not reduce their own levels of support as the federal support level increased.

We would strongly encourage that federal support programs be channeled through existing state education departments or agencies. This would assure a more effective and efficient planning and coordinating of education programs, both at the state level and at the point where services are delivered to children.

Again, Chairman Perkins, the Kentucky Education Association appreciates your invitation and this opportunity. You can be sure you have our continued support in the fine effort you are making.

(Whereupon, at 2:50 p.m. the committee adjourned.)

(The following statements and letters were submitted for the record:)

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 8, 1972.

Hon. CARL PERKINS,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I am enclosing a copy of a letter that I have received from one of my constituents, Mr. Hobart Jones who is Assistant Superintendent of the Guthrie Public Schools in Guthrie, Oklahoma. I thought you would be interested in the survey that he made of his school. I would appreciate any consideration you might give this matter.

Sincerely,

HAPPY CAMP,
Member of Congress.

Enclosure.

GUTHRIE PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Guthrie, Okla., March 2, 1972.

Congressman HAPPY CAMP,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I am writing you at the suggestion of Mr. Bill Moyer of Gage, Oklahoma, who was in my office today discussing some problems we might have with federal programs in education.

There are two problems in regard to Title I, E.S.E.A. that I feel need some attention. The first problem deals with identifying of eligible students, using the income of parents as the criteria. Section 1.11 under definitions read "'Low Incomefactor' means number of children of families earning $2,000.00 or less, according to the 1960 census." I believe that the $2,000.00 figure is much too low. As an example, we ran a survey of our schools (see attachment) and found that there are a total of 158 students in grades K-12 whose parents' income is between $2,000.00 and $3,000.00 (see column 4 of attachment). I believe these students should also be eligible Title I students.

The second problem regards the establishment of a parent council Section 2.16 of "Eligible Applicants". This section states that parents of children to be served in the Title I project shall constitute the majority of the members of such council. This council is to help in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the project. Seems to me, this is an illogical requirement. The purpose of Title I, as I see it, is to help students break the cycle through education and raise themselves above a poverty level when they become adults. Guidelines specified above makes it possible for low income people to control or recommend to the schools how this money is to be used to educate their children. It seems to me this would defeat the purpose of the whole program. The parents are not able to raise themselves from this poverty level, but can now tell us how to use this money for a program to benefit their child.

Silly, isn't it?

We appreciated very much the visit by Mr. Moyer and the opportunity to express ourselves to him and you about the above problems being faced by all schools when dealing with the federally controlled programs of education.

Respectfully yours,

HOBART L. JONES,
Assistant Superintendent.

TITLE I--SURVEY

	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Col. I: Receive aid from welfare	38	39	48	49	32	41	38	50	35	39	37	34	18
Col. II: No aid received, income less than $2,000	9	12	9	12	16	11	13	13	13	10	14	16	12
Col. III: Total title I students in cols. I and II	47	51	57	61	48	52	51	63	48	49	51	50	30
Col. IV: No aid received, income $2,000 to $3,000	6	12	12	15	16	12	16	8	25	12	7	11	6
Col. V: No aid received, income over $4,000	98	148	176	148	165	157	154	181	160	183	178	164	147
Total (cols. III, IV, and V)	151	211	245	224	229	221	221	252	233	244	236	225	183

Note: Total (col. III): 658 students identified as title I students.

RUSSELLVILLE CITY SCHOOLS,
Russellville, Ala., March 12, 1971.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: Yesterday I wrote to you regarding our need for an increased appropriation in the Elementary Secondary Education Act. I kept my letter brief because I felt that you were collecting specific information and that I should stick to the question asked.

I appreciate the fine support that you, Congresswoman Green, our own Congressmen, and the other members of your committee have given those of us in education. Federal funds for education are absolutely essential, and I am thankful that we have people like you and the others mentioned above who are aware of this fact.

In your letter of March 3 you stated that you would like to hear from us on other aspects of education support programs. While I appreciate your efforts, the different offices above us—State, Regional, and National Offices of Education and personnel employed there have mandatory requirements that are making it impossible for us to administer these funds in the best interest of children. Of course, I know that controls, budget practices, and similar things are necessary. I have no objection to these; but we are required to write projects, projects, and projects. Reports have to be written, re-written, and evaluated over and over, until the backlog of paper work is almost prohibitive. These people are researching us to death. Consequently, a great deal of the money appropriated by you people never really gets to the classroom where the children are because of the high administrative costs. Supervisors do not have time to supervise. School administrators paid by local funds find themselves "bogged down" in excessive reports and evaluations. Please do not misunderstand my attitude in this matter, but I wish you had some way of knowing how many projects we have to write, how many copies of each proposal are required, the amount of time we spend in proving comparability, and how difficult it is to live with the restrictions and policy guides set up by those in offices above us. Policies and forms are changed before one can become familiar with them. For example, the last proposal written for our small school system was over 100 typewritten pages and it was rewritten four times with numerous copies supplied to these personnel each time it was re-written.

I know that research is necessary, and I know that a certain amount of feedback is necessary in order for those in responsible positions to know that funds are being well spent. I am for these things, but I wish there was some way to eliminate some of the questionnaires, project applications, reports, etc. demanded of us. Anything you can do that will enable us to spend more of the federal funds in a way that will directly affect and benefit the children will be appreciated more than you will ever know.

Sincerely,

R. M. COURINGTON,
Superintendent.

TACOMA, WASH., *March 18, 1972.*

Congressman FLOYD V. HICKS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Is there any chance that this whole issue of education (including the racial/busing problem) might be resolved by giving tax credits for education and allowing people to choose for themselves what constitutes a "quality" education?

I believe this idea has been presented in the past, but I don't know the extent of serious consideration it has received. The proposal I have in mind would be to allow a tax deduction for private education expense (including college tuition) not to exceed the cost per student now being taken from public funds. Parochial schools need not be excluded because such a program would not amount to state financing of religion, but instead grant to all individuals (regardless of race, creed or religion) a choice in the use of their tax dollars for the education of their own children.

Those funds not taken individually through tax credits would still be available for the public schools, reduced only in direct relation to the number of students who no longer attend. (The size of the student body wouldn't drop immediately for the simple reason that there are very few private schools presently in existence—at least in the Tacoma area.)

If and when private education is made available and able to compete financially with the public school system, the overall trend should be toward an *improvement* in the quality of education by creating a broader base of experimentation in teaching methods and materials. As the enrollment dropped in public schools the tendency in public education would be toward smaller class size with more individual attention and/or consolidation of the existing school districts, which might involve busing and might also result in racial integration—not by mandatory order, but as a natural consequence.

This proposal would give tax *relief* at a time and in an area where it is sorely needed, instead of adding to an already unbearable burden as President Nixon's proposal would (which should be unthinkable considering our present economic state). It would add a new dimension to the educational possibilities for our children and at the same time the best existing public facilities would remain in use for those who would still rely on the public system.

I think we have a very dangerous situation developing wherein mass public funding is giving government a virtual monopoly in the field of education. I do not believe this is consistent with a free society or the principles of liberty by which we are supposedly governed. In this respect I think that a system of tax deductions for private education would be a step in the right direction by leaving the choices (and the money) where they belong—in the hands of the individual instead of the state.

I hope you will give this proposal serious consideration and I would appreciate hearing your views on its possibilities.

Sincerely,

(MRS.) JEAN HOCKMAN.

MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS,
Hobbs, N. Mex., May 2, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
U.S. Representative,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We are concerned about the direction and uncertainty concerning the future of present federally funded programs that have been a tremendous asset to the boys and girls of our community. We hope we do not lose sight of the specific programs such as Title III—NDEA or Title II—ESEA, that have served well and deserve continued support.

The National Defense Education Act—Title III, has helped us introduce innovations in the use of up-to-date materials and equipment for such programs as: (1) educational television productions and closed circuit programs, (ii) video

taping of career education opportunities within our area, (iii) learning laboratory equipment for disadvantaged as well as advanced learners, and (iv) classroom equipment for day to day use, such as overhead projectors, cassette and tape recorders, 16mm. projectors and various other student used equipment and materials. Education today is in a chaotic swirl of change and challenge and without help, state and local finances cannot provide the needed modern equipment and materials demanded for success.

The Title II—Elementary and Secondary Education Act has also brought tremendous success in our school system. It is specifically for books and educational copyrighted materials for ready use in laboratory and classroom learning activity. We feel that this Title of the Act should retain its unique character and should not be buried in a broad new category such as "The Library Resource Account". This program has provided us with: (i) elementary, junior high and high school libraries throughout the system, each containing thousands of available books and materials, (ii) films, film strips and cassettes, and tapes of programed learning materials, and (iii) charts, maps, globes, etc., which the student handles and refers to daily.

We feel that most senators and congressmen have been steadfast friends of education and that you are concerned about our problems. We hope that you recognize what it would mean to us if we had a major cutback or the elimination of these successful historic programs in education. We request your support for continued funding of these significant programs, as we count heavily upon them for a successful school year.

Sincerely,

R. N. TYDINGS,
Superintendent.

WASHINGTON COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Springfield, Ky., May 15, 1972.

Representative CARL D. PERKINS,
House Education and Labor Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PERKINS: It is our understanding that at the present time no funds have been appropriated by the Office of Education for NDEA, Title III.

We in Washington County are very interested in this program. During this school year, we were able to purchase 23 Educational Television sets for all of our elementary schools. These were purchased through a state bid price of $6167.60. Since these sets were purchased with our NDEA Title Grant, the cost to our Board was only $3083.80.

The funds that we have at our disposal in Washington County are very limited and it would not have been possible to purchase these sets without the help we received from the National Defense Education Act.

Also, we have received many benefits from Title II, ESEA. With the help we receive from this fund, we are able to purchase additional library books, audio-visual materials and supplementary books so badly needed in our school district. Title II, ESEA is unique since it benefits both the public and non-public school equally. Our total grant for Title II, ESEA the year was $4800.

Please give serious consideration to the funding of these two worthwhile federal programs. They both serve the ever increasing needs of the poor school districts.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

MILTON K. GRAHAM, *Superintendent.*

FRANKLIN NORTHEAST SUPERVISORY UNION,
Richford, Vt., May 9, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PERKINS: I am writing in regard to the educational funding now under consideration. I am particularly concerned about the lack of

funding of E.S.E.A. Title II and National Defense Education, Title III. I'm concerned that the "Library Resources Account" will enable Title II to become lost or buried.

I have six elementary schools and two high schools under my supervision. Each of the schools, which are included in five separate and self-governing units, has been able to purchase equipment and books under these accounts. Our pupils are reading and utilizing our libraries more than ever before. We could *not* have made as much *progress* without these federal programs.

If there is one overall concern expressed by school directors in Vermont, it is that there is mounting opposition to federal programs that begin and then gradually fade out, or result in the local districts having to finance them. It is a growing disenchantment which is dichotomous in that we educators are very grateful because of the tremendous benefits to young people, but the School Directors, under tremendous pressure from local taxpayers because of added programs, wish that there would be no more federal programs, or at least fewer, and especially those that require local districts to pick up the costs at a later date.

I do hope that you will support funding for these programs.

Sincerely yours,

FOREST T. FARNUM,
Superintendent.

NEENAH JOINT SCHOOL DISTRICT.
Neenah, Wis., May 11, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: It seems incomprehensible that, at a time when taxpayers all over the nation are complaining about property taxes for support of local school programs, the Federal Government would consider cutting or deleting Federal Aid which it provided when times were good and it was not so desperately needed.

The need for additional Federal Aid is NOW. Federal Aid as it was provided in Title III NDEA has done much to boost our local program. We could not possibly have equipped our science and foreign language areas as well, or as fast as we have, without this very helpful Federal funding. At present it is helping us to build an individualized reading program and some vocational courses.

Title II ESEA, has been instrumental in providing us with centralized libraries in all of our elementary schools during the past five years. It is now needed to supply audiovisual type materials for individualized instruction. If it is buried in "Library Resources" it will never reach the areas where it will do the most good . . . it may never reach the public schools at all.

The people who are not on the "home front" have no idea what the ability to use funds from these sources has done for the morale of students, teachers and school districts in the past few years. We expect your support in our behalf.

We, the undersigned, respectfully request that you consider legislation which will continue the above programs at, or above, the level provided in the past.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD SCOTT,
Superintendent.
BLANCHE MCINTYRE.
Director of Instructional Materials.

MASSACHUSETTS SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENCY UNION,
Plymouth, Mass., May 8, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PERKINS: It is difficult for me to understand why each year the Congress and/or the Administration displays a reluctance to fund what every school administrator of my experience places second in priority only to ESEA's Title I as the most effective of all Federal aid-to-education programs.

Title III represents one of the very few opportunities for a sharing of fiscal responsibility between the local and Federal governments. It represents to the

taxpayers a return on both his local real estate and Federal income tax payments. If you were to change the rules to provide 100% Federal funding, I'd argue that you had removed the most wonderful element of the program. As it stands, we at the school community level decide what we need to improve our curriculum. We seek approvals for full funding from our School Committees, our Finance Committees, and our Town Meeting Members. It is only when we have these approvals and have developed a rationale sufficient to the requirements of State education officials that we receive Washington's support. The system has its checks and balances and makes good sense to those of us who every day are working to make things better for the children of our separate towns and cities.

There are too many Federal grab bags in Education, in Space, in Defense . . . you name the area and we'll find the pet projects that are pleasing only to a few properly placed theorists.

Plymouth and Carver have used Title III to upgrade their abilities to take reasonable advantage of the technological explosion that has occurred all around us. We are not talking here about the esoteric. Tape recorders, films, projectors, a language laboratory for the high school, science equipment, math computers, a sound system for music . . . all of these have come to us through Title III.

Local School Committees are hard pressed to convince Finance Boards and Town Meetings that important items of equipment can be afforded even though their advantages is willingly enough recognized. Somehow, Title III represents a cooperative effort from Washington. Frankly, this is one of a very few such efforts that we have found available to us.

Interestingly enough, local taxpayers are beginning to recognize that the so-called "repressive" Real Estate taxes are, in amount, less than the personal income to the State or to Washington. At least they are totally aware of where the local dollar is spent, what goods and services the townspeople receive. Take Title III away from us, and we are again made to wonder just where those dollars will now be used.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM GAULT, JR.,
For 4,919 students in our district.

BERRYESSA UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT,
San Jose, Calif., May 17, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: The schools of every state need the continuing support provided by programs such as the National Defense Education Act.

Berryessa is a rapidly growing school district with little industry. Our tax rate is high, but our expenditure per child is low. Through NDEA projects and Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act we are able to secure many of the needed materials for improving our learning programs. We now have two demonstration library projects in operation through assistance from Title II of ESEA. We have strengthened our reading and math programs with materials and equipment purchased under NDEA. Both of these projects have stimulated financial allocation of local funds.

Please support the continuation of the National Defense Education Act and Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY REID,
Assistant Superintendent.

SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 1—PARK COUNTY,
Powell, Wyo., April 26, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HONORABLE PERKINS: I have received communications concerning what will be done with various Title Programs sponsored by the Federal government in relation to public education.

I would like to call your attention to specifically two Title Programs which have been of utmost benefit to public schools, even those in the northern regions of the State of Wyoming. I am referring to Title III NDEA and Title II ESEA. Title III NDEA, has assisted, I think, everyone that has part in the program in developing new programs and also helping to maintain good solid educational opportunities for the youth of America. Title II ESEA, has made available to the centers of learning materials, which are so necessary if we are going to be able to keep up with the demands of public education.

I urge your serious consideration during your liberations to maintain or even expand the two mentioned Title programs—always keeping in mind that the mistakes you make and the mistakes I make affect the lives and future of our coming generations.

Sincerely,

J. NEAL LARGE,
Superintendent of Schools.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, House Education and Labor Committee, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PERKINS: Enclosed is a letter which I received from one of my constituents which contains some quite well thoughtout proposals relative to federal support of education. I would appreciate any comments which you may have regarding the feasibility of his legislative recommendations.

Thank you for your assistance.

Best wishes,

GUNN MCKAY,
Member of Congress.

Enclosure.

LAYTON, UTAH, *March 8, 1972.*

Hon. GUNN MCKAY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCKAY: In President Nixon's State of the Union Address he mentioned that the Federal Government should assume a much larger part of the responsibility in funding public education. I have long felt that schools should be under local control and therefore, Federal support of education worries me because of the possibility of losing local control of the schools. However, I can also see that public education in the U.S. is in a very bad way and most of the problems and solutions revolve around money. The Federal Government has the money, the states and local governments do not. Therefore, though I fear it, I can see no other solutions to our problems in education than to turn to the Federal Government for the money. Since you are part of the group of men who will ultimately decide how the Federal Government will fund schools, I would like to offer some suggestions.

In order to protect local control of schools I feel that a certain amount per student should be given to every district. This could be per Average Daily Attendance, Average Daily Membership, or any other equitable method. This money should be appropriated with a minimum of restrictions. This kind of funding would allow a school district flexibility to work on its own special problems. In other words, this money is not to be earmarked for any special area of education, but to be used as the local boards see fit. The Government may also wish to help finance districts with special problems and in areas of special need (eg. central city, minority groups, Indian education, etc.) but this money should be over and above the basic amount allotted to each district on a per pupil basis.

If and when the Government starts to support the public schools to a much greater extent, the states may be tempted to withdraw their support of the schools. This would, of course, be counterproductive. The schools are already in dire straits financially and federal money should be used to encourage states to continue at least their present level of funding of schools. The amount of money should be awarded on a basis of percent of state budget that is spent on the schools. For example, the government may decide to award $100,000 for

each 1% of state budget spent in education. Then a state that uses 20% of the state budget for schools would get an additional $2,000,000 to be used by the state in public education. This type of funding would be especially beneficial to a state like Utah which uses more than 30% of its budget in education.

America has traditionally accepted the concept of equal education for all of our youth. The recent ruling by the California Supreme Court states that financing the schools by property taxes is unconstitutional because it favors children in wealthy school districts. I assume that one reason for federal funding of education is to pick up the slack when property taxes to support the schools are withdrawn. However, I don't think that a district that wishes to spend extra money on its schools should not be allowed to do so. The concept of equal education for all is a good one but not practical. A more realistic goal would be a minimum standard of education for all funded by federal and state governments, but allowing local school districts to raise money by taxes or other legal means if they wish to provide even better education opportunities for their youth.

I would appreciate your considering these ideas as you work out plans for financing the public schools.

Sincerely,

JESSE S. BROWN

BARRINGTON, ILL., *May 4, 1972.*

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PERKINS: First of all, I want to commend you and the other members of the Committee on Education and Labor for the early action and attention which were given to education legislation in 1971. The '72 fiscal education programs became law in July, and this had a very favorable effect on school planning in terms of implementing local programs during the '71-72 school year.

It is hoped that you and the education committee with which you are associated will do everything possible to expedite '72 fiscal education legislation so it, hopefully, becomes law in July, as it did in 1971.

Further, it is hoped that the principle of categorical aid will again be built into '73 fiscal legislation. Most educators agree that two of the most successful provisions of the '72 Federal education program were ESEA Title II, which has made possible several thousand new educational media (library) centers. This program has made available to millions of boys and girls up-to-date instructional materials for the study of the numerous new topics in the modern school curriculum. Individualized learning in library instructional materials centers has been greatly improved and facilitated.

The second very successful program currently supported with Federal funds is NDEA Title III. Some observers might say that this program has now fulfilled its original objectives and is no longer needed. This is, in my opinion, not true. The NDEA Title III program has been broadened over the years to include not only science, math, and foreign language materials but also social studies, language arts, and other curriculum disciplines.

The matching funds feature of this act is a good one in that it requires local school personnel and Boards of Education to carefully scrutinize spending.

Further, the matching feature enables the local school to purchase $2 worth of materials and equipment to improve instruction for an investment at the local level of $1. From the Federal viewpoint, the program generates a $2 result with a $1 investment.

Your support for the above programs and point of view is respectfully requested.

Sincerely yours,

P.S. Your report as to the status of '73 fiscal Federal education legislation would be appreciated.

WALTER E. JOHNSON.

RICHFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Richfield, Minn., May 9, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PERKINS: I wish to express my concern regarding the outcome of congressional hearings on proposed appropriations of funds for successful continuance of both Title III NDEA and Title II ESEA.

Cutbacks of appropriations in these historic programs will in my estimation have severe repercussions in the development of programs aimed in providing opportunities for students in our public and private schools.

In my many years of work in teaching and administration in the public schools, I know of no other federal programs that have had more direct impact upon learning activities. The reality of having equipment and supplies to accommodate the vast variety of multi-learning situations has made possible the true individualization of instruction and the provision of opportunities for young people to assume a greater share of their own learning activities.

New learning styles demand wide variety of learning tools which can be placed at students disposal in a variety of learning stations. Previously this was not possible under the available resources in schools throughout the nation.

Specifically, in one of our junior high schools we have been able to develop learning centers which are capable of providing opportunities in productive learning activities for 10-20 percent of the building population at any one time. These learning centers are not merely the typical depository of additional books which was previously the case with school libraries, they are now providing a variety of resources which is gradually replacing the single textbook approach to teaching.

This could not have happened in our school district to this date had it not been for the assistance provided through the above mentioned federal titles.

We have many learning activities which we would like to develop in the future. Present district resources will not be adequate to move ahead with the development of these activities. I strongly urge you to support the continuance of Title III NDEA and Title II ESEA as they are now constituted so that these activities may become a reality.

Sincerely,

HAROLD A. RASMUSSEN,
Director of Secondary Education.

EDWARDS COUNTY SCHOOL LIBRARIES,
Albion, Ill., May 5, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: The introduction of NDEA and ESEA funds to our school budget brought a dramatic increase in the amount of materials available for classroom instruction and independent study. Before NDEA and ESEA funds, the scope of our instructional materials collection was so narrow little was provided beyond the textbook. We tried loans from our public library and the State Library, but this was insufficient. Local funds, with our small assessed evaluation, could not provide for all areas of our educational budget and build an adequate instructional materials collection at the same time.

It has always been our goal to provide sufficient materials of a high quality to supplement and enrich the classroom instruction. Before NDEA and ESEA funds this was impossible. The approval of the first NDEA and ESEA programs brought the realization that at last enough materials could be available to develop the abilities of our students and extend their interest beyond the required textbooks. Excitement ran high when the impact of NDEA and ESEA funds hit Edwards County, Illinois.

Each child in America has the right to learn. The child's right to learn carries many responsibilities in its wake and the nation that meets the responsibilities of the right to learn will reap benefits far beyond the imagination of many in education today. Guaranteeing the right to learn will be a slow and costly process, a process that will gain momentum with each new generation blessed with the right to learn. Then and only then will we be able to realize the true blessing that NDEA and ESEA funds have been to our schools.

Daily children face forced learning restrictions because of close financial boundaries in their schools. The learning restrictions suffered by the children of America will only prevent the continued greatness of the American way of Life. On behalf of the children of America, I urge you to give your full support to the continuation of NDEA and ESEA funds to guarantee the children of today and tomorrow the full enjoyment of their right to learn.

Sincerely,

EMIGENE POLLARD.

THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
MADISON, WISC., *April 17, 1972.*

HON. CARL D. PERKINS,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PERKINS: As a result of my testimony to your committee in Minneapolis on January 11, 1972, I felt compelled to illustrate the dependence of the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction on federal funds to fulfill its mission in the state of Wisconsin.

Enclosed is a reprint from the April Issue of the *Wisconsin School News*. Tables 3 through 5 should dramatically present the case for continued and expanded support to state educational agencies under Section 503, Title V, Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

I am sure that you will find this data supportive to your long standing efforts to improve public education in these United States.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

ARCHIE A. BUCHMILLER,
Deputy State Superintendent.

Enclosure.

[Reprinted from the April 1972 issue of the Wisconsin School News]

A PROFILE OF THE WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: A POINT OF VIEW ON PROGRAMS AND SUPPORT

(By Archie A. Buchmiller, Ph. D., Deputy State Superintendent)

The casual observer who examines the financial budgets of state agencies in Wisconsin is likely to conclude that the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction must be among the giants of these agencies. The 1971–72 appropriation (1) of $386,968,200 (13 percent of the state budget) would appear to lend support to such a conclusion; however, a more critical sifting and winnowing of all of the facts on all agencies including the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction's program, budget and staffing would yield a far different conclusion. Questions naturally arise in regard to the Department's multi-million dollar enterprise. How many dollars in this budget are sent through the fiscal pipeline to local school districts? What influence does the federal government have on the Department's programs and manpower? How much does the state invest in its primary educative responsibility for leadership, services and technical assistance to local school districts?

A historical review of the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction's budget would reveal a significant change in the pattern of operations during the last thirty years. Two of the major changes in this pattern would be more dependence upon federal funds for state agency operations and a greater emphasis on instructional specialization and technical assistance to local school districts. This marks a significant departure from the earlier role of disbursing aids, collecting statistics, and providing ancillary services and supervision.

A review of the 1971–73 biennial budget provides information about the program, staffing and financial resources of the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. The 1971–73 appropriation structure shown in Table 1 enables one to categorize the operation of the Department into five major programs or areas: (1) State and Federal Aids to Local Educational Agencies, (2) State and Federal Aids to Public Libraries, (3) Residential School Operations for the Visually Handicapped and Deaf, (4) Special Grants to Local Educational Agencies and Individuals, and (5) State Agency Operations. The appropriation data for 1971–72 show that state and federal aids to local educational agencies account for 96.6 percent of the Department's budget, .2 percent is allocated for state and federal aids to public libraries, .6 percent for the operation of the residential schools for the visually handicapped and deaf at Janesville and Delavan, and 1.9 percent for state administration of state and federal programs. These data are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 1.—1971-73 LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS

Statute, agency, and purpose	Source	Type	1971-72	1972-73
20.255 Public instruction, department of—(1) Promotion of educational equality and opportunity:				
(a) General program operations	GPR	A	$5, 855, 500	$6, 213, 900
(b) Teacher aides and language training support	GPR	B	2, 000, 000	2, 000, 000
(c) Fuel	GPR	S	37, 000	38, 000
(d) Aids for handicapped children general	GPR	S	26, 798, 200	31, 661, 700
(e) Aids for handicapped children home instruction	GPR	A	203, 500	215, 300
(f) Elementary and high school aid	GPR	B	230, 761, 400	253, 174, 500
(fb) Special tuition payments	GPR	A	978, 100	3, 468, 600
(fc) Cooperative educational service agencies	GPR	A	551, 000	646, 000
(fd) County colleges	GPR	A	755, 189	0
(fe) State school lunch aid	GPR	S	0	1, 100, 000
(ff) Transportation aids	GPR	B	13, 538, 100	14, 128, 000
(fi) Public library systems planning grants and aid	GPR	B	144, 000	728, 000
(fj) Teacher social security	GPR	S	25, 963, 000	31, 005, 000
(fk) Teachers retirement	GPR	S	38, 233, 000	42, 049, 000
(g) Activity therapy	PR	C	8, 700	9, 000
(i) Gifts, grants, and trust funds	PR	C	1, 000	1, 000
(j) Surplus property	PR	C	245, 800	246, 900
(k) Publications	PR	C	20, 000	20, 000
(kz) School lunch program handling charges	PR	C	325, 000	325, 000
(m) Federal aid	PR-F	C	37, 247, 380	37, 556, 100
(q) Driver education	SEG	C	2, 282, 580	2, 283, 300
(r) School library aids	SEG	C	1, 100, 000	1, 100, 000
20.255 Department totals:				
General purpose revenues			345, 727, 900	386, 428, 000
Program revenue			37, 847, 880	38, 160, 000
Federal			(37, 247, 380)	(37, 556, 100)
Other			(600, 500)	(603, 900)
Segregated funds			3, 382, 580	3, 383, 300
Total—all sources			386, 958, 200	427, 981, 300

State revenues provide 84 percent, or the largest share of the aids paid to local educational agencies, while the federal government provides for 16 percent. For public libraries these percentages are almost reversed, 18 and 82 percent respectively. The residential school operation costing approximately $2,583,201 for visually handicapped and deaf students at Janesville and Delavan receives 94 percent of its funds from the state. Finally, special grants to local educational agencies and individuals are supported 5 percent by state revenues and 95 percent by the federal government; and state agency leadership, services, technical assistance and administration are supported 48 percent by state funds and 52 percent by the federal government. State agency administration and services must be interpreted as a necessary overhead factor to accommodate the fulfillment of legislative and congressional guarantees and administrative requirements. Leadership and technical assistance from the state to local school districts and libraries help them to maintain and improve the delivery of their programs and services to the state's young and adult citizens.

TABLE 2.—STATE AND FEDERAL BUDGET ALLOCATIONS FOR 1971-72

Category of expenditure	Total	Percent	Percent of total financial resources: State	Federal
State and Federal aids to LEA's	$407, 027, 269	98.6	84	16
State and Federal aids to public libraries	793, 589	.2	18	82
Residential schools for visually handicapped and deaf	2, 583, 201	.6	94	6
Special grants to LEA's and individuals	2, 958, 963	.7	5	95
State agency operations	7, 835, 446	1.9	48	52

MANPOWER

The employment of sufficient skilled manpower is necessary to fulfill legislative mandates, accommodate effective administrative delivery systems and provide

technical assistance and leadership to agencies of local government created by the Legislature. Only when an adequate cadre of competent manpower is provided to a state agency can a full measure of accountability be expected from it. Agency mandates and expectations are not self-fulfilling.

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction cannot be considered to be a large state agency. The Legislature has authorized the Department 565.8 positions for the 1971–72 fiscal year. Many other state agencies, among them the Departments of Health and Social Services; Transportation; Natural Resources; Labor, Industry and Human Relations; Revenue; and Administration; to name only a few, are larger. The Department, exclusive of the staff required at the schools for the visually handicapped and the deaf, can be characterized as a medium size state agency. The breakdown of authorized employees for 1971–72 is shown in Table 3.

Approximately one-third of the total positions authorized by the Legislature to the Department of Public Instruction are for the schools for the visually handicapped and deaf at Janesville and Delavan. These schools provide twenty-four hour residential care as well as comprehensive kindergarten through twelfth grade educational programs during the regular school terms. These two schools are a vital part of the state's total outreach to the handicapped. The balance of the Department's positions, 65 percent, is dedicated to the state administration, technical assistance, services and leadership to Wisconsin's public elementary and secondary school systems (56 percent) and to public libraries (9 percent).

TABLE 3.—AUTHORIZED STATE AGENCY POSITIONS AND FUNDING FOR 1971-72

Category	Total positions authorized = 565.8		Funding	
	Number	Percent of total	Percent Federal	Percent State
Residential schools for visually handicapped and deaf	199.2	35	12	88
Public library administration	51.0	9	61	39
Public education administration	315.6	56	45	55

The federal government's influence on the Department is dramatically visible in both public library and education administration since over one-half of the positions in these two areas are federally funded. This runs counter to the generally held assumption that all state employees are paid from state sources of revenue.

AREAS OF STATE AND FEDERAL INTEREST

Since the data reveal that the federal government has a significant influence upon the Department's operations, the question naturally arises as to what program areas are attributable to state and federal financial support. On an overall basis, 44 percent of the positions and 64 percent of the funds of the Department are provided by the federal government. Conversely, the state authorizes 56 percent of the positions and 36 percent of the funds. This larger number of state general purpose revenue positions, but lower financial support for these positions, attests to the fact that many state-funded employees tend to be administrative and clerical. Table 4 shows some of the state and federal program categories, percent of state and federal positions, and source of funds supporting them.

TABLE 4.—ALLOCATED MANPOWER AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR STATE ADMINISTRATION 1971-72

Category	Percent of total positions		Percent of total State administrative funds	
	Federal	State	Federal	State
Composite State-Federal administration	44	56	64	36
General State administration and supporting services	15	85	19	81
Education and medical services for handicapped	63	37	81	19
Curriculum and instruction	44	56	77	23
Experimental instructional programs in local school districts	100	0	100	0
High school vocational education	80	20	91	9
Early childhood education	100	0	100	0
Educationally disadvantaged, Indian education, desegregation, and urban education	93	7	96	4
Public library services	39	61	57	43
Planning and evaluation	60	40	75	25

Generally, state financial support of the Department relates to administration of aids, providing supplementary services, fiscal accounting, record keeping, information processing, shared cost instructional specialization, planning, domiciling, and mangerial coordination of the agency operations.

Federal funds, in addition to administrative implemention of categorical federal programs, have reached out into priority areas such has technical assistance, for instructional improvement, experimentation, vocational education, planning research, evaluation, medical service to the handicapped, the educationally disadvantaged and minority groups. The trend toward instructional specialization cited earlier in this study can be illustrated by the specialist positions shown in Table 5. These data also show that many areas are one-of-a-kind specialties, most of which must serve approximately 440 school districts. Regularly scheduled consultation with local school districts is often in terms of intervals covering many years between visits, providing, in relationship to actual needs, little more than a token response of technical assistance to local school districts.

As a result of these often competitive forces, the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction is a complex crosswalk of local, state and federal interests. The cutting edge of the federal interest is often in areas of high social and educational concern. The state interest is greater in financial aids and special services. Local school district needs often are set aside under the pressures of state and federal concerns. The roles often blend as far as the public is concerned, and due to the federal influences, the Department is frequently perceived as the enforcer of rigorous administrative rules and regulations.

TABLE 5.—NUMBER OF SPECIALISTS SERVING LEA'S AND SOURCE OF FUNDING, 1971-72

Specialist positions	Federal funds	Federal and State funds	State GPR and/or segregated funds
A. General education:			
Art	1		
Audiovisual		1	
Conservation		1	
Curriculum			2
Driver education, alcohol education, traffic safety	2		2
Early childhood	1		
Education innovation and supplementary services	5		
Educationally disadvantaged	4		
English language arts		1	
Foreign language		1	
Guidance counselors	3		
Health education	1		1
High school graduation equivalency testing			1
Indian education	2		
[illegible] and junior high schools		1	
[illegible]ion			1
Pub[illegible]nsultants			1
Read[illegible]	1		5
School desegregation	1		
School district classification	1		
School library consultants			1
School psychologist	1		1
School social worker			1
Science	1		
Social studies		1	
Teacher education and certification		1	
Urban education	1		2
Vocational education:			1
Agriculture		3	
Business and office occupations	2		
Career education	1		
Distributive education	1		
Home economics		2	
Industrial arts		1	
Trade and industry		1	
B. Exceptional education:			
Curriculum—special education	1.5		
Deaf education			1
Emotionally disturbed			1
Hearing conservation	3		
Medical services for crippled children	7		
Mentally retarded	1		
Physical-multiple handicapped			3
Speech correction			1
Vision consultant			2
			1

TABLE 5.—NUMBER OF SPECIALISTS SERVING LEA'S AND SOURCE OF FUNDING, 1971-72—Continued

Specialist positions	Federal funds	Federal and State funds	State GPR and/or segregated funds
C. Special services:			
Educational data processing	1.25		.25
Legal consultant			1
Pupil transportation			2
School buildings and facilities			2
School budget and audit	1		3
School district organization			3
School food services	2		4
Total	45.75	14	44.25

[1] Segregated funds.

As long as federal aids flow through separate categorical channels and state services and resources are not provided in response to local needs, the role and the perception of state educational agencies is not likely to be changed. Frequently state officials and the public assume that any state employee can be used for any purpose, not recognizing that federal categorical funds almost invariably preclude assigning employees to other activities or programs. The nature of these categorical funds is such that they can be used only for the purpose for which they are granted.

FUTURE IMPLICATIONS

Recent fiscal system decisions by courts in California, Texas, Minnesota and New Jersey are giving new weight to the generally held principle that "education is a state responsibility." These decisions are beginning to identify conditions inherent in the constitutional right that reasonably equal educational opportunities cannot be limited by the wealth of the district of the child's residence. Also emerging appears to be a stronger guarantee that the "fundamental interest" of the state must be manifest in educational opportunities which must be available to all children. Other court actions suggest that the school district is a legislative convenience which may not be used to deny constitutional rights.

These decisions apparently will require the states to re-examine their fundamental educational interest and fiscal delivery systems in the light of these new judicial interpretations. If this reappraisal dictates a more decisive and firmer state interest, it may also mean that state departments of public instruction will also emerge from he doldrums of a long period of benign neglect. It is likely that state educational agencies may be vested with new expectations and authority by state legislatures and required to play a far more influential role in the state to assure constitutional guarantees of access to equal educational opportunities by all students.

1. Wisconsin Laws of 1971, Chapter 125.
2. Ibid.

FOSTORIA CITY SCHOOLS,
Fostoria, Ohio, May 2, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
House Owce Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The reports regarding the discontinuance or reduction of funds for NDEA Title III and ESEA Title II programs are of tremendous concern to us. The Fostoria City School District is not large, having an enrollment of about 3,600 students, but we have our proportionate share of low income and other educationally disadvantaged families.

While we are a non-additional aid district, we just passed through a time when it was nearly necessary to close our schools because of a lack of financial means.

The Fostoria Schools' allocations for NDEA Title III is about $3,600 and about $7,200 for ESEA Title II. While these are not large amounts when compared to larger school districts, the funds are being used to satisfy children's needs that could not be met without these funds.

The Title III Program has helped us to provide modern teaching materials and equipment that could not be provided without Federal financial aid. Likewise, school libraries in all of our elementary schools which will provide a better

the library material that is provided by Title II is helping us to establish central educational atmosphere than we now have and allow us to enhance our elementary program to meet more of the needs of the individual students.

We strongly urge you to make a thorough investigation of what the various Federal aid programs are doing for the schools of the country. It is believed that you will find it would create a tremendous hardship on most schools which will be detrimental to the educational program if the funds referred to are discontinued.

It is hoped that you will support programs for the aid to the public elementary and secondary schools of our country.

Sincerely,

RALPH MCCAMBRIDGE,
Superintendent of Schools.

OLTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Olton, Tex., April 26, 1972.

HON. CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Olton Independent School District has benefitted tremendously from the Title Programs. I would urge you to use your influence with your fellow Congressmen to continue the NDEA III Program, as well as all others.

I would also urge you to continue the Title II Program as an essential element of ESEA and not bury it in a broad new category, the "Library Resources Account."

Sincerely,

JOE L. TURNER,
Superintendent.

COVINGTON CITY SCHOOLS,
Covington, Tenn., May 9, 1972.

Hon. ED JONES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JONES: Our Covington City School system is very concerned to learn that there is a possibility that two federal-aid-to-education programs which have meant a great deal to our boys and girls are in danger of being eliminated. We urge you to not let this happen. These programs are: Title III NDEA and Title II ESEA.

This year our elementary science students and teachers submitted a Title III NDEA project for $2,000, which was approved and funded. It enabled us to secure equipment for individual student work; and science has become a vital, interesting study, when before we had to rely heavily on lecture and textbook reading because of lack of equipment. As you know, this program requires an equal amount of local matching funds, so the total of federal aid in our case was just $1,000; but it has made a great deal of difference.

Six years ago our system began to establish badly-needed libraries in our schools. With the aid of Title II ESEA, we have built our book collection to the state requirement. Therefore, we were able to use local funds to provide the full-time librarians which we do not receive from the state minimum program. We count on Title II ESEA to help us in this important part of our schools' curriculum. Further our system submitted a competitive Special Purpose Title II ESEA proposal this year for $5,000, which was funded to secure materials for math and science. Again, local effort was marshalled to remodel facilities to make us eligible for competition. Because of this, our school library program is becoming a resource center for students.

The study, planning and implementation of project activities as well as the funds received from these two programs have strengthened our school curriculum. We feel that these programs are two of the best-administered, most valuable federal aid programs in operation.

At its meeting on May 8, 1972, the Covington City School Board passed the following resolution:

"The Covington City School Board of Covington, Tennessee, respectfully requests that the United States Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and

the House of Representatives Education and Labor Committee recommend continuance of Title III NDEA and Title II ESEA.

Further, the Covington City School Board instructs its board chairman and superintendent to send a copy of this resolution to the following:

Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.
House Education and Labor Committee.
Honorable Howard Baker, Jr., United States Senate.
Honorable William Brock, United States Senate.
Honorable Ed Jones, House of Representatives."

We ask that you give this request your consideration.

Sincerely,

ALTON A. PACE, *Chairman.*
JOHN B. GULLEY, *Superintendent.*

CASWELL COUNTY SCHOOLS,
Yanceyville, N.C., April 27, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House Education and Labor Committee,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PERKINS: The possibility of loss of some federal funds is frightening to us. Our programs have been expanded and increased in numbers with new personnel being employed. Real, concrete, measurable progress has become a reality in this southern, rural school system with the assistance of federal funds.

In our rural area with little industry and advalorum tax is unable to provide the revenue needed to support a good school system, even when coupled with a reasonable share of state support. Federal monies are a must!

Without ESEA Title III monies this school system would never have been able to support a $210,000.00 research project. Having had a Title III Project in the area of Educable Mentally Retarded children, a totally new individually prescribed curriculum has been developed.

ESEA Title I for disadvantaged children has made a dramatic change in the school program. The Title I budget of approximately $450,000.00 per year exceeds the local budget, since from 40% to 60% of all the school children come from families with incomes of $3,000.00 or less. Teachers, aides, librarians, guidance personnel, materials, supplies, and equipment have changed a mediocre program into the initial stages of a good compensatory program.

The libraries have grown from an average of 3+ volumes per pupil to 10+ volumes per pupil under ESEA II. The approximately $7,000.00 per year of ESEA II has enabled each school to have a library, update and increase the number of volumes, and move toward the concept of a true Media Center.

NDEA III has been the primary source for updating and acquiring science, math, social studies, and language programs and equipment for individualized instruction. A loss of NDEA III would mean approximately $7,000 which is matched with an equal share of local funds. The latitude which is permitted with NDEA III funds allows a great deal of flexibility in planning at the local level.

We encourage you to take swift, positive action to assure that the 5641 school age children in Caswell County have a better educational opportunity with the participation of federal funds. As we try to redirect the Title I program to meet the revised guidelines we are in the process of displacing 14 professional people and 14 para-professionals. This is disturbing, to say the least, as we reduce the adult-pupil contact. A complete loss of federal funds would be catastrophic. We urge you to support established categorical programs and work toward a balanced general aide program for a better educated citizenry tomorrow.

Sincerely,

THOMAS H. WHITLEY,
Superintendent.
LAWRENCE C. WALKER,
Assistant Superintendent.

SCHOOL DISTRICT OF SPRINGFIELD TOWNSHIP,
Oreland, Pa., April 27, 1972.

Congressman CARL D. PERKINS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: Until general aid federal programs can be devised to maintain the present level of assistance, it is imperative that the cate-

gorical aid on which so many schools and students depend be continued. Such programs include NDEA Title III and Title II.

NDEA Title III funds aid in improving our instructional program by enabling us to purchase audio-visual equipment which provides strong impetus in up-dating our science curriculum. We have, also, been able to purchase equipment to help us re-vitalize our Junior High School industrial arts curiculum.

The Title II funding is making it possible for us to purchase necessary books and instructional materials which otherwise could not be budgeted because of unprecedented strong local tax resistance.

We are well aware of your staunch efforts to provide the best possible education for all of our children.

We enlist your continued support for these two clearly identifiable programs that have served education well over the years.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS W. PAYZANT,
Superintendent.

DERBY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 260,
Derby, Kans., April 25, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
U.S. Representative,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PERKINS: The schools of Kansas need your support. Two programs we cannot afford to lose are: Title III of the National Defense Education Act, and Title II of ESEA. We feel that funding of these two very important programs must be continued if we expect to keep pace with new innovations in the uses of materials and wtih improvements in equipment. Our Kansas school library problems have persisted into the present time even with the support of the above two programs.

Since 1965, in our own school district, with the assistance of Title II for materials and Title III, NDEA for equipment, we have changed from a library structure of six elementary libraries under the process of centralization which was supervised by an elementary coordinator of library services with no elementary librarians and with three secondary schools each staffed with a librarian who did his schools' processing to a coordinated library structure districtwide, K–12. At present, no processing is done in the schools. Materials arrive at the school ready for shelving and card sets arrive ready for filing as the materials arrive.

All acquisitions, cataloging and processing is done in the district materials center under the supervision of the District Coordinator of Library Services. The above improvements have created uniformity in collections, in subject headings, services, etc.

We presently have full time librarians in nine of our ten attendance centers. The school not staffed full time does have a half time fully qualified librarian who teaches half time in the same school. Even with the cited improvements, we are still far below the national standards for media center materials and personnel. We tried for a Demonstration Library in one of our very best media centers this year but did not qualify for a grant. To lose the support of the above named programs that have so greatly contributed to our growth and improvements, would be disastrous for us. Please give our needs your serious consideration.

Sincerely yours,

LOUISE DIAL,
Coordinator of Library Services.

MORGAN PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT 636,
Morgan, Minn., April 26, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PERKINS: May I ask your support for Title III of the National Defense Education Act and Title II of ESEA? I understand that there is a possibility that these two programs may not be funded for next year.

We have found that both of these programs have aided us greatly in the past and with very little bureaucratic red tape like some programs.

If it hadn't been for Title III NDEA we would never have had funds to purchase (what we now consider essential) such equipment as tape recorders, cassettes, overhead projectors, TV camera and other audio visual materials. We have purchased materials to enrich our programs in almost all areas.

Much the same could be said for Title II ESEA. Our library has been supplied with many books and audio visual materials that we never had resources with which to purchase. It gives us a terrific boost to get these funds for specific areas.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

LYLE B. LAW, *Superintendent.*

GADSDEN CITY SCHOOLS,
Gadsden, Ala., April 24, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: I am writing you in regard to congressional hearings on proposed appropriations for education. I am concerned that no funds for Title III of NDEA are proposed and that Title II funds might be buried in a broad new category. Both of these titles have been very successful and have meant a great deal to education in Alabama. In this state, with its low average income, it would be impossible for the children to successfully compete with children of other states without these federal funds.

I would urge you to consider funding Title III at the 1971–72 level and funding Title II at the local level.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT G. JOHNSON,
Coordinator of Special Programs.

GONZALES INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Gonzales, Tex., April 24, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PERKINS: As Director of Federal Programs in the Gonzales Independent School District, I am writing to urge you to do whatever you possibly can to maintain or increase the present level of funding for ESEA Title I, II and NDEA Title III.

The Gonzales Iedependent School District operates, as do many other school districts, on a "bread and water" budget. This school district simply cannot afford to absorb the cost of providing the services and materials to the disadvantaged student which are presently funded under ESEA Title I, II and NDEA III. Any loss of federal funds to a district such as Gonzales means that *all* students will feel the "pinch."

Regardless of some opposing opinions about Federal Aids to schools, the Gonzales schools have benefited greatly from these funds. In particular, ESEA Title II has provided books and media that otherwise would not have been purchased with local funds.

Continuation of these Federally funded programs is the only means available to the Gonzales Independent School District to provide for the needs of *all* students attending this school system.

I know the Gonzales school system is only one of thousands receiving Federal funds and our voice may not be heard by many, but we are asking you to hear us and do your part in maintaining or increasing the funding levels for ESEA Title I, II and NDEA Title III.

Yours truly,

ROBERT D. CASKEY,
Director, Federal Programs.

INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 173.
Mountain Lake, Minn., April 25, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PERKINS: It is of great interest that funds be made available for NDEA Title III and Title II of ESEA. These two programs have helped our school system and many in the state. It is administered with greatest efficiency and gets help to areas of instruction where it really counts. I feel these funds have helped more than any others in providing instructional resource materials to schools and children. In Minnesota with the change in our financing, we need this extra help continued and expanded.

The programs also encourage local schools to take a part in Title III NDEA on a shared basis. The Title II program requests that schools do their part in order to qualify.

Your consideration for continuation of and appropriations for these programs is requested.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY DREWES,
Superintendent of Schools.

LITCHFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 79,
Litchfield Park, Ariz., April 24, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House Education and Labor Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PERKINS: The purpose of my letter is to ask for your support in securing legislation which will provide for the appropriation of ESEA, NDEA, and other categorical funding needed in American public education.

The categorical funds are the only means by which it is possible for me as superintendent to exceed state minimum provisions and avoid tax over-rides in my district.

With eighty per cent of the school budget going toward salaries, maximum bonded indebtedness, military impactness, and new facility needs, we manage to operate a "bare bones" program.

It seems ironical to read about the expenditure for the development of a new military tank costing taxpayers $100,000,000 over a ten year period with additional funds needed to extend development into a second ten year period. Anticipated costs unknown and probably reaching a quarter of a million dollars.

This amount alone equals the national need to fully fund PL 815 which would relieve school districts in the country of an undue burden.

The question of accountability is often misplaced, making school managers who serve over one fourth of our populace suspect and overly demanding.

There is a choice to be made as to whether we fully insure our initial investment or take a risk relying on probabilities. I think the record is clear when we consider what educational expenditures have attained over the past years.

Do we now allow for regression and respond later when another Sputnik or similar incident occurs? Are we to respond to crisis or are we to respond to changing needs?

The answer can be learned for every congressional leader if he was to commit himself to spending time in the schools and the reality of the problem.

I ask for your support and of those on your committee simply on the grounds of need and national interest.

Thank you for your attention to a common cause.

Sincerely,

CHARLES R. MEDEIROS,
Superintendent.

MUSKEGON AREA INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Muskegon, Mich., April 28, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: It is with utmost concern that we write you about pending educational legislation. Literally thousands of children are reading good books that would not have otherwise been available. As an Intermediate Office working with a large segment of western Michigan, we are in a position to know that these materials would *not* have been available without Title II of ESEA.

Even more dynamic in its impact on student learning is the acquisition of splendid teaching films. Without Title III of NDEA, the number of films available would have been pitifully small.

In Michigan, as in other states, the need for local school taxation has been beyond the means of the community to support. The Title III and Title II monies have made the big difference in meeting the needs of the children we serve. For myself and for our total staff, I earnestly solicit your support of the necessary continued legislation.

Sincerely,

TRUMAN OWENS, *Superintendent.*

MEIGS COUNTY, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Decatur, Tenn., April 28, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: We are concerned about proposed legislation that is being considered in Congress that may possibly eliminate some of the older federal education programs that have been tested and found to be worthwhile. These programs are serving their purpose and should be continued.

We would like for NDEA Title III to be continued. We are planning to utilize this program in fiscal year 1973 to continue to upgrade instruction. Title II of ESEA is important to our school system because it is the only source of funds that is directly pointed toward improving libraries.

This school system has a NDEA Title III project submitted to the Tennessee Department of Education for approval at this time. We feel this project is outstanding because we are going to attempt to bring Educational TV into rural school classrooms from a Transmission Station 38 air miles away. Rural schools, we believe, suffer greatly for the lack of learning motivation and program enrichment. This NDEA Title III program is the only available source for this improvement.

This school system has used ESEA Title II sources since its conception to purchase library books. None of our school libraries meet standards beyond those requirements established by our State Board of Education. This program helps to fill a need in our school system.

Please consider your support in keeping these categorical programs identifiable in character so that small school systems can continue to utilize federal resources to improve instruction for our boys and girls.

Yours very truly,

ROBERT A. LADD,
Superintendent, Meigs County Schools.

NEW MADRID COUNTY R-1 ENLARGED SCHOOL DISTRICT,
New Madrid, Mo., April 25, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PERKINS: I have recently noticed that this Congress has been concerned with certain progressive steps in education, but on the other hand certain other important factors have been neglected to date. I would like to call this to your attention and urge you to take steps to see that these deficiencies are corrected, too.

One of these is the National Defense Education Act. Its Title III, for example, has made a significant contribution in introducing various types of innovations in the use of modern materials and equipment. Currently, there are no funds for Title III proposed by the Office of Education. I believe that at least $50 million should be set aside, as was last year, for a matching grant program to be continued. In fact, I think the amount should be greater than $50 million to do the job that should be done in this area.

Also, I am concerned about Title II of ESEA. I question seriously whether this program should be placed in the new category of Library Resources Account. I have yet to see a reason for this change, and all of us are aware of the great contribution this program has made. Therefore, I urge that it be retained in its previous form.

Yours truly,

GEORGE S. REUTER, JR.,
Superintendent.

NATCHEZ SPECIAL MUNICIPAL SEPARATE SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Natchez, Miss., April 24, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Among the *best* of the federal aid projects in giving financial assistance to the local school districts are:

Title II of the National Defense Education Act (50% matching of local funds for purchases in most curriculum areas).

and

Title II of the ESEA (library supplement).

Please continue these programs for the 1972–73 school year.

Sincerely,

D. G. MCLAURIN,
Superintendent.

GERMANTOWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL—DISTRICT NO. 60,
Germantown, Ill., April 24, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: As chairman of a 8-district cooperative mobile instructional materials center I would like to appeal to you to work for the extension of ESEA Title II and NDEA Title III.

These specific titles have done incalculable good in:

1. Making a wide range of audio visual available to 127 public school teachers and 73 parochial school teachers.
2. Serving the needs of 2,572 public school pupils and 1,487 parochial school pupils.
3. Encouraging these school districts to work at their problems jointly.
4. Encouraging cooperation between the public and private schools involved.

If these titles should be discontinued with the shortage of school funds that we are all experiencing, it is doubtful that we would be able to continue the present cooperative which we have found so advantageous to our pupils.

Please help us.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. LAMPE,
Superintendent.

KIEL PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Kiel, Wis., April 24, 1972.

Hon. CARL PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing this letter because of one that I received from the Committee on Educational Legislation. They ask that we in Education indicate to you how special educational apportionments have assisted our schools to better meet the needs of our students.

NDEA Title III has long helped us obtain at a minimum of local cost special educational materials and equipment such as movie projectors, overhead projectors, radios, phonographs, etc., which allows our teachers to diversify their educational presentations to include visual information which would otherwise not be of benefit. I am sure that virtually two-thirds of the audio-visual materials available to the one hundred members of our staff have been purchased through this phase of government funding. In addition, funds received from Title II are very beneficial. The need for resource materials would become staggering if the total funding would be obtained locally.

The taxpayers of the Kiel District have recently completed a new high school facility. In moving to this new building, it was necessary for us to divide our resource materials between two buildings, necessitating large expenditures in an attempt to augment our present facility with materials of the type and level needed by students of varying educational backgrounds. Locally we have expended large amounts of funds in an attempt to alleviate this situation quickly. However, without the aid of Title II Funds, I am sure that our local efforts would have been unable to accomplish the necessary stock of our resource centers. Therefore, it is my opinion that Congress will need to continue to appropriate funds for these worthwhile expenditures, and ideally hope that the amount of federal money available to local schools will be increased rather than decreased.

I need not inform you of the burdens of our highly regressive local property tax upon our local taxpayers. Any monies that can be gleaned from the federal coffers will help to improve our local educational efforts far beyond what we could hope to accomplish locally.

If it would be useful, I would be willing to document more accurately exactly what benefits have been derived from the various categorical aids so that all members of the Congress might understand how beneficial these programs have become to our small rural community. Please feel free to call on me for any assistance that I might give, as I feel that the education of our youth is the most important obligation that we have for the future of our country.

Sincerely,

DAVID J. BASSUENER, Ph. D.,
District Administrator.

WAYNE COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Corydon, Iowa, April 24, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PERKINS: Some reports out of Congress indicate there may be efforts to scuttle appropriations for Title III, NDEA and Title II, ESEA. I sincerely hope you will consider the effects of not appropriating any funds for these two programs, especially on rural school districts in our nation. Title III, NDEA has allowed most districts to up-grade their equipment, especially audio-visual equipment, which is so essential in a multi-media approach which permits different and individualized approaches to learning and teaching. Title III, NDEA requires local funding and therefore better ensures the better utilization of funds.

Title II, ESEA, at least in Iowa allows funds for print and nonprint materials which is dispensed to local districts through area Media centers. These materials are of such nature that most local districts could not individually afford and therefore by a cooperative effort through the area media center, these expensive materials are made available.

Local school district's sorely need the funds provided by these two programs and we sincerely hope you will see fit to continue their funding.

Thank you for your consideration.

Cordially,

CHARLES FRIZZELL,
Superintendent.

BAY ST. LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Bay St. Louis, Miss., April 25, 1972.

Hon. CARL PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PEEKINS: We are very much concerned with some of the proposed changes being advocated in assistance to public education at this time. It seems to us that the administration of some of these programs has finally been improved upon to the point that they are just now really working for the benefit of children as originally intended. For this reason we wonder why the need for further change.

We refer specifically to Titles I and II of ESEA and Title III of NDEA. These programs are administered from the state level with little outside interference and are really working great for the public schools of Mississippi.

With the advent of modern trends to individualize instruction in education, schools like ours will find it virtually impossible to supply the equipment, materials, and personnel required without federal assistance of the nature provided in the above mentioned programs.

We appreciate the fine work you are doing for your country and beg you to continue support for the educational programs so badly needed at this time.

Yours sincerely,

J. D. MCCULLOUCH,
Superintendent,
DONALD CALDWELL,
Assistant Superintendent.

OHIO COUNTY SCHOOLS,
Hartford, Ky., April 25, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PERKINS: I would like to encourage your support of refunding the National Defense Education Act (Title III). These funds have helped us tremendously in the past few years and especially in our recent building program that was completed last summer and which we now occupy. Without these funds we will be handicapped because our local effort will not be able to furnish us sufficient funds to replace those received through Title III. Our students deserve your best efforts and support which will enable us to continue Title III as in the past.

The same is also true of Title II, ESEA, which needs to remain as it has been in the past. These funds have, in the past, enabled us to purchase library books and supplies for our students, which could not have been obtained otherwise.

We in Ohio County ask your continued support in this important legislation and feel that you will support us to the best of your ability.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. PARK, *Superintendent.*

SUMNER COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Gallatin, Tenn., April 24, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERKINS: As a superintendent of a public school system responsible for the development of educational programs that meet the needs of the youth of my community, and for finding the financial resources with which to pay for these programs, I am very concerned about the federal budget requests for education presented to the Congress a little while back. My major concern is for the inadequacy of the over-all proposed expenditures for education. I do not feel that these figures reflect anything like a fair share of the costs of education which the federal government should be assuming. I am concerned specifically

about some of the programs which are omitted from the budget and for which there are no substitutions. Among these are Title III, NDEA, and Title II, ESEA.

For the past several years now we have had to fight to save Titles II and III. As a school administrator, I do not understand why these programs which are so popular and which have been so useful in building quality into educational opportunities for our youth have to be subjected annually to the threat of abandonment. They don't amount to a lot of money, neither of them. They haven't made national headlines since Sputnik gave an impetus to NDEA in 1958. But they have enabled school administrators to provide badly needed educational resources. For instance, during the past three years we have, in my school system, set up four (4) complete industrial arts shops for junior high schools with Title III, NDEA, funds. Without these funds I am positive that we would not have been able to do this. I can cite many other cases of furnishing science laboratories, supplying schools with basic and enrichment materials for teaching history, geography, civics, economics, and providing school libraries with collections of books covering the various instructional areas. All this and much more has been done in the Sumner County School System within the past few years with Title III, NDEA, and Title II, ESEA, funds. It would be dreadful to imagine the situation with our instructional program if we had not had the use of these funds.

May we count on your support in the Committee and on the floor when educational programs and appropriations come up?

Sincerely,

GENE W. BROWN,
Superintendent, Sumner County Schools.

DUPLIN COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Kenansville, N.C., April 27, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: We are greatly concerned and indeed disturbed about the status of NDEA Title III and ESEA Title II. These two programs have contributed a great deal to our educational program in Duplin County. In a sense they are more flexible than most programs. In this age of multi-media teaching materials when the library, or media center, plays such an important role in supporting individualized and independent study, NDEA Title III has provided badly needed equipment along with other teaching materials for which no other funds were available. Since NDEA III has become less earmarked as practically every area of instruction has become eligible for its assistance, it has really been a lifesaver in our unit.

Complementing NDEA Title III, ESEA Title II has provided educational materials of all kinds for use with all children—much of it to be used with the equipment purchased with NDEA Title III. This program was designed for the acquisition of school library resources, and it has done just that. It seems a shame to discontinue the only program ever designed specifically to provide library type materials. It also seems a shame to discontinue well established programs that have been so successful for several years and for which there is still such a great need and replace these programs with new ones which we have no assurance will succeed.

We feel that the loss of funds provided by ESEA Title II and NDEA Title III would greatly hamper our educational program. Please do whatever you can to see that these two successfully proven and sorely needed programs receive continued support.

Very truly yours,

C. H. YELVERTON,
Superintendent, Duplin County Schools.

Mrs. VIRGINIA P. QUINN,
ESEA Title II, Coordinator, Duplin County Schools.

D. B. TEACHEY,
Assistant Superintendent, Personnel and NDEA Title III Coordinator.

THE JOINT COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM,
OF ALLAMAKEE, HOWARD AND WINNESHIEK COUNTIES,
Decorah, Iowa, April 25, 1972.

Hon. JOHN C. CULVER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CULVER: I am writing to you to help identify the federal programs that have served education well over the years in our area and are deserving of your continued support.

One of these programs is Title II of the Elementary-Secondary Education Act which has provided crucial library materials for elementary and secondary pupils in both the public and private schools in Iowa.

Our Area I Media Center serving six counties has an inventory of approximately 1200 16mm films and approximately 30,000 library books available to each and every boy and girl of our 31,000 elementary and secondary boys and girls, public and private, in Area I.

This entire program of resource materials was made available to our six counties of Area I through the allocations of Title II federal funds channeled through our State Department of Public Instruction.

As sub-agency chairman of our Area I Title II ESEA program, I urge that this program be continued so as to retain its unique character, so successfully developed over the past six years.

Our Area I Media Center is also providing additional valuable materials and services as a result of the Title II federal funds that have been allocated to our area. This program, undoubtedly, is one of the best and most productive educational programs ever made available to our boys and girls in Iowa.

Thank you for your support of this valuable program.

Sincerely,

ABNER A. HENDRICKSON,
Superintendent.

SOUTHMORELAND SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Scottdale, Pa., April 28, 1972.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House Education and Labor Committee, The House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In the very serious problem of securing adequate funding for public education I call to your attention the importance at the local level of the existing programs that have meant so much to districts such as ours and ask your support that these programs may be adequately funded for the coming fiscal year.

Specifically, the Title II Program of the E.S.E.A. has made it possible for our District to increase the number of volumes in our libraries by nearly one third more than we have been able to secure from our general fund expenditures alone. We are approaching the immediate goal of ten volumes per pupil but with the increased costs of the materials, need this program if we are to upgrade the library offerings to meet the childrens' need.

The Title III program of the National Defense Education Act has been truly a categorical aid that has had a strong impact upon the curriculum within our District. We have been able to develop more meaningful programs for students in the areas of science, mathematics, English, languages, social studies, industrial arts and this year hopefully the fine arts.

I do express the sincere appreciation of our local Board of Education and of our District for your efforts in developing the above mentioned programs. Please give consideration to these existing programs as you work with the funding of Federal Programs for the coming year.

Very truly yours,

J. GORDON NEVIN,
Superintendent.

STATE OF HAWAII,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Honolulu, Hawaii, April 18, 1972.

Hon. SPARK M. MATSUNGA,
Member of Congress,
Cannon Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MATSUNGA: Several months ago, the Hawaii ESEA Title III Advisory Council contacted you regarding changes planned by the U.S. Commissioner of Education for the admnistration of ESEA Title III Programs, more specifically, use of the Commissioner's 15% discretionary reserve, Sec. 306. We are now satisfied that the amendment to the Higher Education Act submitted by Senator Alan Cranston (D–Calif.), together with later changes tentatively proposed by the Commissioner, will preserve the intent of Title III with respect to future use of the Commissioner's Title III ESEA discretionary funds. We wish to express our gratitude for your efforts made to support our concern.

Recently, however, we were apprised of certain aspects of the Education Revenue Sharing Act, currently pending before Congress, which appear to threaten future conduct of the entire Title III Program in Hawaii. This Act proposes to consolidate 33 Federal sources of educational funds while repealing existing Congressional legislation. Most of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 as amended, including Title III, would be repealed by such action. We are particularly concerned that the Education Revenue Sharing Act, as currently drafted, could eleiminate funds for the support of innovation programs in education by its failure to stipulate the need for such programs. As you know, funds now received under ESEA Title III by the State DOE, have enabled Hawaii to effect comprehensive statewide curriculum reforms and as such, have provided Hawaii's student population with outstanding educational improvements. We would hope to be able to continue this initiative and achievement in the future.

The National Association of State Advisory Council Chairmen (NASACC) has asked for the support of all ESEA Title III State Advisory Councils regarding preservation of the intent of Title III in this year's Congressional draft legislation. After careful analysis, the Hawaii ESEA Title III Advisory Council adopted the attached resolution regarding amendment to the Education Revenue Sharing Act submitted by the Nixon Administration for Congressional enactment. We urge you to review our resolution with close consideration and hope that you will support our attempt to make these views known by communicating with the appropriate members of Congress.

Thank you again for your efforts on our behalf.

Yours respectfully,

JOHN A. BROWNELL,
Chairman, ESEA Title III, State Advisory Council.

It is hereby resolved, That the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—Title III Advisory Council for the State of Hawaii acknowledges the need to preserve the intent of Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 as amended, within the Education Revenue Sharing Act and all subsequent Federal legislation for education. Further, the Hawaii ESEA Title III Advisory Council urges that members of Congress amend the Education Revenue Sharing Act to stipulate that:

(*a*) Federal funds be used to supplement rather than supplant existing State appropriations to education, and;

(*b*) The same percentage of Federal funds currently devoted to support programs in educational innovation be at least maintained within the context of this Act.

It is also resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to members of the Board of Education of the State of Hawaii, and to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to the United States Commissioner of Education, to each member of the Senate Subcommittee on Education, to each member of the House Committee on Education, to each member of Congress from the State of Hawaii, and to each member of the Education Committee of the Hawaii State Legislature.